17466

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR.....Carol A. Brodie.....

TITLE OF THESIS.....Social Desirability and Meaningfulness Scale Values on a Selected Set of Personality Trait Descriptors

UNIVERSITY.....University of Alta.....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED.....M.A.....

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....1973.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed).....Carol A. Brodie.....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

.....11036 - 85 Ave.....

.....Edmonton, Alta.....

.....

DATED Sept. 28.....1973

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES ON A SELECTED SET OF ADJECTIVE PERSONALITY TRAIT DESCRIPTORS

by

© CAROL ANN BRODIE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled, "Social Desirability and Meaningfulness Scale Values on a Selected Set of Adjective Personality Trait Descriptors", submitted by Carol A. Brodie, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

K. Howarth
.....
Supervisor

R.K. Sinha
.....

George Kupfer
.....

Date..... August 23, 1973

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to obtain an adequate pool of personality trait descriptors that were (a) highly meaningful and (b) with the bias of social desirability removed, toward the ultimate purpose of obtaining behavior ratings by "others" and self-report, with subsequent verification of cross-medial similarity.

Firstly, a review of the literature was undertaken in order to assemble a pool of personality trait descriptors, adjectives being chosen for their simplicity of presentation. Most studies considered contained shortcomings, however, the work of Norman (1968) and Anderson (1968) provided relatively comprehensive pools of trait descriptors: Norman's study contained 2800 adjectives and Anderson's contained 555.

Secondly, the social desirability and meaningfulness data supplied by these researches were used as a basis for setting arbitrary cut-offs to obtain descriptors in a neutral range of social desirability, and in the upper range of meaningfulness, for both sexes.

Thirdly, a final list of 200 selected adjectives was administered to students enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course to obtain social desirability and meaningfulness scale values.

The results showed correlations, ranging from 0.62 to 0.86, with adjectives from both the Norman and Anderson studies despite the different scales used by the two researchers. A list of 114 adjectives was found to be within the neutral range of social desirability, in the upper range of meaningfulness, and to be unbiased with respect to sex.

The implications of this study for further research were outlined, focussing on the future possible use of these trait descriptors for behavior ratings. The response style controversy was reviewed to assess the need for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere thanks to her committee chairman, Dr. E. Howarth, whose constant encouragement, supervision and assistance made this thesis possible. Thanks is also extended to Dr. B. Sinha, as a member of the committee, and to the external examinor, Dr. Kupfer.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. B. Rule for her provision of subjects in a convenient testing session.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge the assistance of her typist, Mrs. Lynne Rogoczenski.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
	Rating Studies	4
	The Response Style Controversy	6
	Style and Behavior Correlates	9
	Further Controversy	10
	Social Desirability	12
	Scaling of Responses	12
	Potential Source Pools	14
III	SPECIFICATIONS OF THE STUDY	19
	The Problem	19
	Criteria for Selection	19
IV	RESEARCH DESIGN	23
	Subjects	23
	1. The Social Desirability Sample	23
	2. The Meaningfulness Sample	24
	The Testing Instruments	24
	1. Social Desirability Form	24
	2. Meaningfulness Form	25
	Description of the Rating Scales	25
	1. Social Desirability Rating Scale	26
	2. Meaningfulness Rating Scale	26
	Scoring	26

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Treatment of the Data	27
V	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	28
	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	28
	Means and Standard Deviations	28
	Comparisons	29
	Social Desirability Data	29
	Meaningfulness Data	29
	Correlations	44
	t-test Results	47
	Refined List of Adjective Personality Trait Descriptors	47
	INTERPRETATION	52
	Limitations	55
VI	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	56
	SUMMARY	56
	Purpose of the Study	56
	Associated Literature	56
	The Study	57
	The Research Design	57
	Analysis and Interpretation	57
	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	57
	IMPLICATIONS	59
	Thorndike Frequency Count	63
	* * *	
BIBLIOGRAPHY		69
APPENDIX A(Example of Social Desirability Forms A and B)		74
APPENDIX B(Example of Meaningfulness form)		82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Male Sample (Form A)	30
2	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Male Sample (Form B)	31
3	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Female Sample (Form A)	32
4	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Female Sample (Form B)	33
5	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Combined Male and Female Sample (Form A)	34
6	Social Desirability Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Combined Male and Female Sample (Form B)	35
7	Meaningfulness Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Combined Male and Female Sample (Form A)	36
8	Meaningfulness Scale Values on Selected Adjective Trait Descriptors for a Combined Male and Female Sample (Form B)	37
9	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form A) With Those Obtained from Norman (1968) on a Male Sample	38
10	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form B, Males) With Those Obtained from Norman (1968) On a Male Sample	39
11	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form A, Females) With Those Obtained from Norman (1968) On a Female Sample	40
12	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form B, Females) With Those Obtained from Norman (1968) On a Female Sample	41

Table	Description	Page
13	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form A, Combined Males and Females) With Those Obtained from Anderson (1968) on a Combined Sample of Males and Females	42
14	Comparison of Obtained Social Desirability Scale Values (Form B, Combined Males and Females) With Those Obtained from Anderson (1968) on a Combined Sample of Males and Females	43
15	Comparison of Obtained Meaningfulness Scale Values (Form A, Combined Males and Females) With Those Obtained From Anderson (1968) on a Combined Sample of Males and Females	45
16	Comparison of Obtained Meaningfulness Scale Values (Form B, Combined Males and Females) With Those Obtained From Anderson (1968) on a Combined Sample of Males and Females	46
17	Correlations of Social Desirability Scale Values Between Adjectives Common to Brodie and Norman for Separate Male and Female Samples	48
18	Correlations of Social Desirability Scale Values Between Adjectives Common to Brodie and Anderson for Combined Male and Female Samples	48
19	Correlations of Meaningfulness Scale Values Between Adjectives Common to Brodie and Anderson for Combined Male and Female Samples	48
20	Comparison of Male and Female Social Desirability Scale Values, Form A	49
21	Comparison of Male and Female Social Desirability Scale Values, Form B	50
22	Refined List of Adjectives from Form A and Form B	51
23	Comparison of Sample Size for Social Desirability and Meaningfulness Studies Between Brodie and Norman-Anderson	55
24	Thorndike-Lorze (1952) frequency of occurrence count for the 114 refined adjectives from Form A and B	65

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram	Description	Page
1	Example of Analysis Reported on Each Adjective-Descriptor in Norman (1968) Study	17

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The search for adequate measures of personality, and operationally defined personality dimensions has been (a) long continued and (b) only moderately successful to date, probably a major reason being inadequate sampling of variables (Howarth, 1972).[1] Yet personality testing and test invention has been extensive--Buros (1970) described over 513 personality tests while stating:

> In this era of remarkable progress in science and technology, it is sobering to think that our most widely used instruments for personality assessment were published 20, 30, 40 and even more years ago. Despite the tremendous amount of research devoted to these old, widely used tests, they have not been replaced by instruments more acceptable to the profession. Nor has the research resulted in a consensus among psychologists concerning the validities of a particular test. The vast literature of personality testing has failed to produce a body of knowledge generally acceptable to psychologists. In fact, all personality instruments may be described as controversial, each with its own following of devotees (Buros, 1970, p.xxv).

Some of the more prominent (and most of them long-standing tests cited were the Rorschach, TAT, MMPI, 16PF, CPI, EPI, each having over 54 references, and having been constructed on a variety of bases, including theoretical schemes, intuition, and more objective methods such as criterion studies or from factor analysis. The present study

---

[1] Howarth and Browne (1972) in the questionnaire medium responded to this previous inadequacy by amassing a source pool of over 3,000 items of which 401 were finally selected based on putative factor hypotheses. Note that all footnotes are numbered "within chapters".

was undertaken within the latter framework, that of "construct validity", because I believe that a broader applicability of findings will result from the discovery of genuine personality factors. My study then, is a precursor for factor investigations of personality dimensions among one of the three media--ratings, questionnaires, laboratory tests--the latter two having recently been investigated on a large scale by Howarth (MBR, 1972; CJBS, 1971, etc.).

Some investigators have begun with one or the other but the intention has often been to obtain cross-medial measurements of behaviors which could be tapped by one or more methods as convenient (e.g. Cattell, 1950). If the "principle of indifference of indicator" (Spearman, 1927) is applicable, one would expect to find similar factors in all media.

Which is the best single method is a matter of preference, and sometimes of controversy[2], and since I have chosen to examine the personality dimensions in the rating media, I believe that ratings can be defended as well as any method, provided that certain limitations are overcome. The purpose of this thesis is, then, an initial investigation in order to overcome some of the more obvious objections which can be made to personality ratings as a method of investigation.

---

[2] A whole body of literature exists in the personality testing domain in all media. Within the more "objective", e.g. factor analytic, approach, prominent early investigators are Cattell, Guilford and Eysenck. Their early and continuing work has provided the source and impetus of recent demand for and research in confirming stable factors of personality (e.g. Howarth, 1970, 1971, 1972, etc.; Sells et. al. 1970; Comrey, 1970). An alternate approach, the "empirically oriented" approach of Gough (1965) and Wiggins (1968) sought continual validation of psychological scales in behavior domain.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the relevant literature in the personality rating and personality testing domain is covered in the review of rating studies and the response style literature.

Objectives

The primary objective was to assemble and locate a source pool of adjective personality trait descriptors.[1]

A second objective in accord with the previously mentioned comments of Buros (1970) was to assess the validity of recent rating studies with respect to length of scales and coverage of the domain, as well as reports on any refinements made for stylistic, response, or sex biases.

Lastly, the literature pertaining to response sets, stylistic biases, ambiguity of items, etc. was reviewed for the purpose of evaluating the need for refinement of scales prior to test administration.[2]

---

[1] Adjectives are suggested by the present study as a viable alternative to "statement" type personality descriptive items that Howarth and Browne (1970) have found to comprehensively representative of the literature over the past 50 years. Adjectives have, in fact, been used as a major component of most rating studies.

[2] These "biases", depending upon the extent to which they contribute to test variance as well as the extent to which they may reflect genuine personality traits or attributes, must conclusively be studied to assess their importance if personality tests are to become more valid and reliable.

Rating Studies

Allport and Odbert (1936) reported the results of an exhaustive research of all "trait names" in the 1925 unabridged edition of Webster's New International Dictionary, listing 17,953 trait names. Subsequently, Allport (1937) divided these into four categories: (a) "real" traits of personality (totalling 4,504) which are consistent and stable over time, (b) temporary and specific behaviors, (c) and (d) more difficult, archaic and seldom-used terms.

An early study and one of the best known was that done by Cattell (1945), in which he reduced the Allport-Odbert (1936) list of 17,953 behavior descriptors to 171 personality variables describing the whole "personality sphere", and subsequently by cluster analysis to 35 variables. A factor analysis yielded 12 factors comprising his A to L system. Cattell (1947) factored 36 rating scales on 133 men and claimed to have confirmed 9 of his original 12 factors.

He subsequently attempted cross-medial verification of his factors, that is, verifying rating factors in the questionnaire and laboratory testing domains using a questionnaire containing "marker items" from a previous indexed list of factors found by various researchers (Cattell, 1950). With respect to this cross-media work, he reported as few as 6 factors confirmed in the questionnaire domain (Cattell, 1950). Since Cattell's questionnaire has become widely used (Buros, 1970) it has caused great concern among many researchers because they have produced convergent evidence that the test factors are impure, lack cross-media verification, and are not recovered by updated methods of factor

analysis.[3] These shortcomings, along with the short number of scales employed, eliminated Cattell's work from further consideration in the present study.

The work of Tupes and Christal (1958, 1961), though based on Cattell's scales, provided one of the few sources of recent rating work as well as stimulating further research (e.g. Norman, 1963, 1966). In brief, Tupes and Christal (1961) analyzed ratings collected on Cattell's 36 scales (1947). Eight separate samples covered varying aspects as length of acquintanceship, type of subject (high school educated airmen to male and female university students), and type of rater (naive person to experienced clinician). They reported that "in all solutions except one, there appeared to be five relatively strong and recurrent factors and nothing more of any consequence." (p. 14)

Norman (1963) presented first his verification of the Tupes and Christal factors (1958) and subsequently, proposed that "it is time to return to the total pool of trait names in the natural language--there to search for additional personality indicators not easily subsumed under one or another of these five recurrent factors." He used 20 scales based on Types' and Christal's work, i.e., their most highly loaded

---

[3] See Becker (1961) who reported replications of only 8 factors in Cattell's 16 PF (based upon original rating and questionnaire work). Levonian (1961) found substantial evidence of within factor heterogeneity. Schaie (1962) found low correlations between media salients. Eysenck (1969) reported low reliability of items and impure factors in Cattell marker items. Sells et al (1970) again found mixtures of Cattell's factors in his analysis of Cattell and Guilford items. Howarth et. al. (1972) factorized Cattell's 16 PF, finding 10 interpretable factors with higher intrascale correlations than Cattell's own factors.

scales for each of the five stable factors. Peer nominations were the basis for describing the personality on either end of a bi-polar description. Five factors were extracted by a normalized varimax rotation. He argued that highly stable and relatively orthogonal personal characteristics have been identified. However, it seemed that such a small number of scales would have only limited use in describing the personality.

Norman saw the need for an "adequate taxonomy of personality attributes... based not only on a comprehensive source of trait names but also on diverse subject populations using raters with varying experience." However, before continuing into the comprehensive taxonomic venture, Norman continued (1964, 1966) to demonstrate the stability of these five factors reported by raters of varying lengths of acquaintanceship.

These rating scales (i.e., personality tests) based on either doubtful analyses and/or limited length and scope (i.e., coverage of the personality domain) presented prohibitive shortcomings to further research aimed at a more comprehensive rating study. Other sources have been investigated in this thesis but will be included in a separate (i.e., following) section since these potential source pools have been somewhat refined with respect to item characteristics that can lead to unwanted sources of test variance, namely, social desirability, meaningfulness, and sex biases.

The Response Style Controversy

This section provides a review of the response style litera-

ture[4] which is pertinent to the present study since social desirability (a response style) ratings were made on personality descriptor items.[5]

Interest in response styles was aroused by Cronbach's (1941, 1942) statement that response styles might be an important source of test variance in objective examinations and personality inventories.

In the past three decades, and more especially, in the early 1960's, a great deal of research has ensued, accompanied by several noteworthy controversies, which have included: (a) the existence, (b) the importance, and (c) the kind of response styles found in personality inventories. Thus, several major papers have been devoted to interpretation of the MMPI in terms of response styles (Couch and Keniston, 1961; Messick and Jackson, 1961; Edwards and Diers, 1962, 1963; Wiggins 1962, 1968) on the one hand versus the opposition on the other (e.g. Block, 1965, Rorer, 1965). Perhaps the best known work has been that of Messick and Jackson (1962) who in a factorial interpretation of several MMPI scales, identified two major factors: acquiescence and social desirability responding.[6] That is, they interpreted the data in terms of response styles rather than in terms of the original "content" con-

---

[4] The works cited in this review of the literature are the major papers occurring between 1960 and 1972. The literature itself to be reviewed comprehensively would require a volume in itself, however, some ten or more critical articles adequately recount the heart of the controversy.

[5] In this section the response styles of social desirability and acquiescence, popular definitions being: a tendency to give SD responses regardless of whether SD response is true or false and a tendency to agree regardless of content of item, respectively. (Block, 1965).

[6] Eight previous studies on MMPI items using 11 to 32 different scales, when reviewed by Jackson (1961) revealed that only two major factors (and two or three minor ones) were necessary to account for interrelations among the scales. Out of 11 subject samples, in the eight studies, 8 significant correlations were reported between the largest interpreted factor for each study and Jackson's acquiescence factor.

structs that the items of MMPI were purported to measure, i.e., the acquiescence-invoking properties of items were not uniform over all scales but were perhaps elicited as a function of item content, ambiguity and is moderated by desirability. More emphasis was placed on SD by Edwards and Diers (1962) who interpreted an unrotated principle component from MMPI scale factoring as a social desirability factor rather than acquiescence especially as it correlated with Edward's SD scale.

Block (1965) claimed to have refuted these findings by presenting evidence showing content-relevant factors in the MMPI, and showing (a) that acquiescence responding could be eliminated by appropriate keying and scoring techniques, (b) that social desirability interpretations though possible remained confounded with content and (c) had not been satisfactorily shown to relate to other behavioral domains and (d) could be eliminated from the major factor by using neutral items.[7] Rorer (1965) presented a comprehensive review of the controversy up to 1965, documenting his scepticism as follows: "response styles are of no importance in determining responses to personality, interest, and attitude inventories" (p. 129). Per contra, he supported a "content" interpretation of MMPI (and other inventories) since response style interpretations in the literature revealed (a) confusing definitions and measures, (b) low intercorrelations of various "contentless" measures of acquiescence and (c) the arbitrary decision to label a factor in terms of response style rather than according to criterion groups that the test (e.g. MMPI) was based upon. Using original and reversed items, Rorer demonstrated that the language properties of inventories could

---

[7] This is one of the aims of the present study.

account for content and keying correlations.

What is important for the present study is that Rorer (1965) supported the need to control for Social Desirability, however, he distinguished it as a "set" (implying contentless responding):

> "Sets may account for a significant proportion of the response variance on personality inventories, and their measure and control are essential if the predictive validity of personality inventories is to be increased." (p. 151)

Furthermore, most writers, on either side of the controversy, have contended that social desirability was of sufficient importance to warrant its control (Jackson et. al., 1961; Edwards and Diers, 1963; Goldberg, 1963; Block, 1965). Much less importance, in general, is attached to acquiescence responding, though again most writers have urged its control.[8]

Style and Behavior Correlates

This issue cannot be left without mention of the crucial question: if response styles exist, then what relevance do they have to personality traits, that is, do they reflect or obscure such traits? (Holtzman, 1968).

McGee has written three critical articles which attempt to assess the degree to which response styles reflect personality traits.[9]

---

[8] It is interesting to note that control is urged, when in general, the existence or at least significant importance of acquiescence is in doubt. As far as the writer has been able to ascertain, few researchers were confident of the proper methods by which to test for it.

[9] However, this review pertained to the response style of acquiescence but serves as a major indication of the sentiments about response styles in general by many researchers. Also, a review of the literature has revealed that authors continually refer to the results of research on one response style as if it generalized to several response styles (McGee, 1962).

McGee (1962a) reported that only a few of the studies (Allison and Hunt, 1959; Crowne and Marlowe, 1960; Jackson, 1958; and Couch and Keniston, 1970) have related response styles to outside criterion. Otherwise he concluded that there is "little defensible data to tie response style to criteria of independently measured behavior" (p. 293). Further studies (McGee, 1962b, 1962c) reported that "only scales containing similar verbal content in the items were related...there is no general trait of response acquiescence independent of specific instruments used to measure it and that prediction of personality traits from response style is not tenable, that is, they correlate with other psychometric measures but not with behavioral measures of social responses".

Further Controversy

The controversy appeared to diminish somewhat after 1965, but was revived in 1971 and 1972[10] in a series of articles in which response style protagonists (Bentler et. al. 1971, 72) presented "new evidence" and significant clarifications of the "old definition" of acquiescence and the antagonists (Block, 1971, 1972) made swift replies to which further rebuttals were made (Bentler, et. al. 1972).

In a 1971 article Bentler et. al. proposed a dualistic nature of acquiescence: (a) the tendency to respond true (agree) and (b) the tendency to endorse items (acceptance). These were conjectured to account for variance, either confounded or unaccounted for by a single definition, and furthermore, the two acquiescences were independent. Morf

---

[10] Though this revived controversy concerns mainly acquiescence, the writer feels that the current status of response styles is worthy of note.

and Jackson (1972) by a factor analytic study claimed to have identified the two types of acquiescence, social desirability and content factors. Block (1971, 1972) contended that Bentler et. al.'s measure of acquiescence as "non-content" responding did not indicate acquiescence more than another interpretation. He did say that agreement acquiescence may be of minor importance but that acceptance acquiescence was untenable. Elaborate experiments based on keying of items, reversals of wording have been interpreted by each writer in turn, according to his own preference.

Bentler et. al. 1972 attempted a synthesis to this long and somewhat futile controversy by noting that Block (1971) in his denial of the importance of acquiescence at the same time stressed its control in inventories, agreed implicitly with the basic tenet of Bentler et. al. that

> "Response styles can obscure or drastically modify the observed interrelationships of content traits, and this variance ought to be identified and controlled." (p. 109)

Similarly, he argued that the controversy will continue

> "without understanding (what response styles are, how they operate, and means to control) attempts at identification and control of response styles will flounder, content will remain difficult to verify, and controversy will persist." (p. 112)

With this the writer is inclined to agree. The response style controversy is as much an unresolved question as it was ten years ago. However, I feel confident that the general support of SD variance in personality inventories warrants the efforts of the present investigation, and that the doubtful status of the acquiescence response and its means of measurement, make testing for it at present

obscure.[11]

From this review, then, attention will be focused on controlling for Social Desirability in construction of a list of personality descriptors.

Social Desirability

Since controlling for Social Desirability, as indicated by the previous review, is a problem facing personality test designers, this section deals with obtaining scale values of social desirability and the subsequent source pools investigated.

Obtaining Scale Values for Social Desirability

Given a set of personality descriptors, it is possible to obtain a social desirability scale value of SDSV for each one. Edwards (1970) reported that several scaling methods exist such as those outlined by Edwards (1957), Guilford (1954), Green (1954) and Ferguson (1959). Since all these methods resulted in SDSV's that are highly correlated with one another, any one method may be fairly reliable. Using one of the scaling methods it should be possible to find the mean rating assigned to each trait as well as the variability with which judges agree on the SDSV of each trait.

Edwards (1970) reported that for a large number of personality trait statements (up to n = 2824 in Edwards' study) that have been

---

[11] The writer notes the advice of Bentler et al. (1971) to anchor adjective descriptors (use polar opposites) to reduce acceptance acquiescence versus using single adjective descriptors. Block (1971) urged use of corrective formulae (Guilford, 1954) to reduce acquiescence bias. These will be taken up at the end of the thesis where further research is considered.

measured for social desirability, and that on selected lists of them, high correlations have been reported between different groups of students, over the age range, sex, and culture. Individual ratings of social desirability correlate highly with normative SDSV as did probability of item endorsement (which bore a linear relationship with SDSV).

When an individual gives an SD response to an item, he is either attributing to himself a characteristic that is judged by the average person as desirable or he is denying a characteristic that is judged by the average person as undesirable, and vice versa for an SU (Undesirable) D response. If few neutral items existed in a list of items of known SDSV's then the relationship between probability of giving an SD response and the SDSV is a V-shaped graph.

Neutral items have relatively low probabilities of eliciting SD responses compared with items with more extreme SDSV's. Because SD responses to neutral items tend to be not highly correlated with SD responses to items outside the range, an SD scale in which many items are relatively neutral could be expected to have a low internal consistency co-efficient.

Using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21, Edwards provided an index of the degree to which items in a scale tend to be positively intercorrelated and therefore a measure of the degree to which the items in the scale are being responded to in terms of a common trait. Because tendency to give SD responses is minimal for neutral items, it might be expected that trait-responding contributes greater test variance on those items. The proportion of neutral items in a scale would then be positively correlated with the K-R 21 value of the scale. But since SD responses con-

tribute to internal consistency of a scale, when minimized as with neutral items, then the K-R 21 value would decrease as the proportion of neutral items increases. This has been found to be so (Edwards, 1970).

Potential Source Pools

From the previous section, it would appear to be advantageous in construction of a personality test to use items with neutral SDSV's. In searching for a pool of such items, the following sources seemed potentially useful.

The Adjective Check List devised by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) was investigated since it was composed of a substantial number of adjectives (n = 300). Parker and Veldman (1969) noting the "lack of empirical analysis of item factor structure of the most commonly used personality measurement instruments" (p. 603) subjected the 300 items ACL to a factor analysis using over 5,000 subjects using a True/False format. The result of a Principal Axes solution and Varimax rotation resulted in seven clear factors, three (at least) which revealed "a strong component of social favorability" (p. 613). He interpreted these three factors as Social Facilitation, Interpersonal Abrasiveness and Social Attractiveness.[12] Work by Bouchard (1968) indicated a substantial amount of item overlap which resulted in inflation of the correlation of items between the scales. These studies indicated that further refinement would probably result in too small a pool of trait descriptors.

---

[12] Dr. Howarth obtained an actual computer output of the factor solution from Dr. Veldman and re-interpretation of the salient loadings revealed three SD factors.

A study by Jones and Rorer (1971) used a list of 89 pairs of polar adjectives originally from Norman's list (1967). The original study of Jones involved some 600 adjectives from Norman's list but the study was not completed due to technical difficulties.[13] Eighteen response bias measures, including scales to measure response stability and consistency, acquiescence, social desirability, yea-saying and extreme response style were assessed on the 89 pairs of adjectives. With respect to social desirability, subjects who responded inconsistently to items tended to respond in a socially desirable fashion as well as no useful associations being reported between personality characteristics and response biases. Seventy-eight of the 89 pairs of polar opposites showed extremely high or low SDSV's.

A study by Norman (1968) using 2800 adjectives, by its large size and comprehensive coverage of the trait-description domain became one of the sources used for the present study. Besides devising this list, Norman had already found SD ratings, meaningfulness values and personality ratings. He amassed some 40,000 terms pertaining to behavior from (a) the Allport-Odbert list, and (b) Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged (1961). Members of the research team acted as judges, and categorized the terms into fifteen rubrics based on judgments of their familiarity, specificity, and certain broad semantic criteria. Of these, 2800 terms were reported in the study (comprising categories one to three), labelled primary, moderately difficult, and

---

[13] This interpretation was relayed in a personal communication to the writer with Dr. Jones, ORI, March 2, 1972.

slangy, quaint, awkward or colloquial. These terms were judged to reflect stable "biophysical" traits and were subsequently divided into fourteen lists of 200 terms each. They were administered to a different sample of fifty male and fifty female undergraduate students, in which they were to define or cross-out terms (a meaningfulness study), state the degree to which they were descriptive of self and three others, one whom one liked, disliked, and was indifferent to, and to rate for SD on a nine-point scale. (See the following diagram.)

Such a diagram accompanied each of the 2800 terms, one for males and one for females. The label "10-WR" denotes the desirability ratings, DP-S, DP-A, DP-B, DP-C refer to ratings of self and three others on a three-point scale. The co-efficients in the lower triangle are product-moment correlations between the respective pairs of tasks. The upper triangle gives the number of respondents answering each pair. The three columns to the right give: number of students in example giving ratings on each task, the mean, and the standard deviation of these ratings. For the present study prime terms with neutral Social Desirability ratings were used.

A study by Anderson (1968) which provided a second source of items for the study was also based on Allport-Odbert's list. He selected 3500 descriptors initially, then these were reduced to 2290 by eliminating (a) extreme words such as ferocious, (b) words denoting temporary states, (c) words pertaining to physical characteristics, (d) strongly sex-linked words and (e) other words such as honey-tongued, fond, etc.

Subsequently, from the results of meaningfulness ratings obtained from twenty subjects, he reduced the list to 555 terms. Finally

DIAGRAM 1

EXAMPLE OF ANALYSIS REPORTED ON EACH ADJECTIVE-DESCRIPTOR IN NORMAN (1968) STUDY

Item No. 10625, Dependent

* TASK	10-WR	DP-S	DP-A	DP-B	DP-C	N	MEAN	S.D.
10-WR		49	49	49	49	49	4.16	2.49
DP-S	.28		50	50	50	50	.76	.71
DP-A	.26	.39		50	50	50	.44	.67
DP-B	.26	.28	.29		50	50	.68	.73
DP-C	.06	.05	-.20	.03		50	.80	.82

he obtained (1) SD ratings using 100 subjects (half of each sex) on a seven-point scale (similar to Norman's nine-point scale), (2) Meaningfulness ratings on a five-point scale using fifty subjects (again half of each sex). Data was given for a combined male and female sample, since between-six differences were small.

Since this list was composed of and yielded somewhat different results than that of Norman, though the two were derived from the same source for the most part, it seemed justifiable to research this area more rigorously to obtain a base pool which will contain items rated on the same set of scales.

CHAPTER III

SPECIFICATIONS OF THE STUDY

A review of the literature provided a source pool of adjective personality trait descriptors. This chapter deals with the problem of "winnowing" these down and with assumptions and actual selection procedure employed, for the future purpose of obtaining a list of adjective personality trait descriptors for a rating study.

The Problem

The source pools for the present study were, for reasons indicated in the previous chapter, those of Norman (1968) and Anderson (1968), containing 2800 and 555 terms respectively.[1] The first task which I faced was to reduce the number of these terms, using the information already reported by Norman and Anderson with respect to Social Desirability, Meaningfulness and Sex Biases. A further set of ratings was then obtained upon a selected list of 200 adjectives.

Criteria for Selection

The following assumptions about the collection of data were

---

[1] Because there was some overlap between the two studies, preference was given to adjectives within the cut-offs in both studies (n = 58).

made and provided criteria for selection of adjectives:

(a) Adjectives selected should fall within a neutral range of Social Desirability, using Edward's (1970) rationale, that is, greater test variance could be attributable to content-responding rather than to response style, e.g.: social desirability.

(b) Only adjectives that were highly meaningful as personality trait descriptors were to be considered (see below).

(c) Sex bias should be reduced by selecting only those adjectives within the bounds of (a) and (b) for both sexes (see below).

On the basis of these three criteria the following steps were undertaken: adjectives were selected from the combined Norman-Anderson studies by establishing arbitrary cut-offs within the range of the Social Desirability and Meaningfulness ratings. Thus, in the case of Norman's study (a) a one-to nine-point scale for Social Desirability was used within which arbitrary cut-offs were now set at 3.5--6.5; (b) for meaningfulness cut-offs were set at subject responses greater than or equal to forty out of a possible fifty.[2] Since Norman reported separate male and female responses for each adjective, an initial culling of the list (for the female population) yielded 164 prime terms, 140 moderately difficult terms and 619 slang, awkward, etc. terms, of

---

[2] Norman(1968) outlined that his meaningfulness data was collected by asking subjects to give synonyms or short definitions or cross-out terms if they had no idea of their meaning. His meaningfulness results, though, are not reported but are "currently being coded to determine difficulty level, the degree of ambiguity and vagueness, and the functional synonyms of each term". (p.14) Thus the strategy of only selecting those terms for which $\geq$ 40 responses were made was adopted.

the 923 terms only the prime terms (164) were retained for further use in the present study.[3]

In the case of Anderson's study (a) the cut-offs used here for Social Desirability within a zero- to six-point scale were two to four inclusive; (b) for Meaningfulness (Anderson used a rating scale for Meaningfulness similar to the SD scale), the cut-off was set at greater than or equal to three out of a possible zero to four range. This produced a list of 174 adjective descriptors.

In addition, any adjective descriptors found to be outside the previous cut-off ranges for either sex were omitted. With respect to Norman's list of prime terms, when the male population was reviewed, 22[4] words from the female data had to be omitted resulting in a list of 142 words. Anderson reported that his results did not show a substantial enough sex difference to be reported separately (since initial pool construction took this factor into account). At this point 142 descriptors from Norman, plus 174 from Anderson had been selected. There was some overlap of terms in the two studies.

---

[3] Dr. Howarth has suggested that one way of obtaining "confirmatory" results or a "definitive" solution in a factor analysis of items representative of a domain is by generating putative factor hypotheses (PFH's). (Howarth, 1972). With respect to the stage of the present study, in an attempt to cover the domain adequately in the selection of an adjective pool, Dr. Howarth independently formulated a set of PFH's, and upon comparison, most were found to be contained within the prime terms selected from Norman's study as well as in Anderson's study. Since Norman himself separated these prime terms from the more difficult categories and since a sufficient number are available, only the prime terms were employed.

[4] Nine of the 22 words were later kept for inclusion in the list since they were minimally outside the range with respect to sex yet were present in the neutral range in Anderson's study.

The third phase, reported in detail in the following chapter on Research Design, was to examine the Social Desirability, Meaningfulness and sex biases of the chosen descriptors. A list of the combined Norman-Anderson terms (n = 267 since 58 items overlap) was available. It was suggested by Dr. Howarth that this list be cut down to 200 for convenience of test administration and computation of results. This was done by omitting (a) polar opposites (usually the positive form of the adjective being retained, e.g. conventional versus unconventional, moderate versus immoderate, etc.); (b) synonyms[5] or near synonyms (e.g. withdrawn versus withdrawing, solemn versus somber, daring versus daredevil, etc.); (c) a few other terms that seemed to be of limited application as trait descriptors (e.g. theatrical, arbitrary, sultry, etc.)

---

[5] With respect again, to PFH's for factors in the rating domain, one wants to avoid what Eysenck (1969) labels T Factors (tautologous), so one does not want to repeat items, i.e., synonyms, too closely within each PFH.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the subject sample, the testing instruments, and to explain the collection and treatment of the data.

Subjects

The Social Desirability and Meaningfulness scale values were obtained from two separate subject samples:

(1) The Social Desirability Sample

The Social Desirability data was collected at a mass testing session comprised of students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Approximately 260 students filled in a personal data sheet (e.g.: name, sex, course, etc.), an attitude survey, and a Social Desirability form, in that order. Each subject responded to either Form A or Form B of the Social Desirability study. The final sample consisted of 254 subjects who had filled out the Social Desirability Form correctly. (The forms rejected for inclusion neglected (a) to state the sex of the subject, or (b) omitted more than 2% of the items, that is, more than two items on any given form.) The sample thus resulted in:

(i) Form A, 56 males
(ii) Form A, 68 females
(iii) Form B, 65 males
(iv) Form B, 65 females

(2) The Meaningfulness Sample

The Meaningfulness data was collected from a sample of 48 students enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course. Since the sample size was rather small, though approximately equal to that of Anderson (1968), separate male and female analysis was not made. The sample consisted of 22 males and 26 females.

The Testing Instruments

Both the Social Desirability forms and the Meaningfulness form were paper-and-pencil forms, consisting of three and five pages respectively (see appendix). The approximate time needed for completion was about 20 to 30 minutes, taking slightly longer for the meaningfulness form, since it consisted of twice as many items as either forms of the Social Desirability study. The Social Desirability forms each contained half the adjectives used in the study, that is, 100 per form with 50 adjectives being presented on each page. The Meaningfulness form contained the total 200 adjectives, again fifty being presented per page.

(1) The Social Desirability Form

Since 200 adjectives were used in the study, it was thought that it would be easier for each subject to rate only half the total number. Subsequently, the adjectives were arranged in alphabetical order, with every odd numbered adjective comprising Form A and every even numbered adjective comprising Form B. These forms were packaged in alternate envelopes (along with the other tests administered) and were randomly administered throughout the testing group. Instructions for the Social Desirability forms were written on the cover page of each form.

Additionally the same instructions were read aloud by the chief administrator of the testing session. An example and clarifying statement were written on the black-board in front of the testing room and were also read aloud by the test administrator. See appendix for the exact wording. Examples of forms A and B are provided in the appendix.

(2) Meaningfulness Form

Since the rating scale was short for the Meaningfulness form (only a five-point scale) and the sample available for testing was rather small (n=48), the 200 adjectives were administered in one form, the first one hundred items corresponding to Form A of the Social Desirability study, and the second one hundred items corresponding to Form B. Instructions written on the cover page were also read aloud by the experimentor. Any questions were answered. An example of the form is provided in the appendix.

Description of the Rating Scales

Rating scales for the Social Desirability forms and the Meaningfulness form consisted of the same format. Each interval on the scales was depicted by a whole number, being of equal "semantic value". Anderson's (1968) format for both scales was closely followed.

For the Social Desirability rating scale Anderson only defined the anchor points, 0 being "least favorable or desirable" and 6 being "most favorable or desirable", which was also done in this study; however, he did put all the intermediate numbers on the sheet for each point of the scale, while in this study just the anchor points were defined and the range of the scale given.

For the Meaningfulness rating scale Anderson defined all

points on the scale, but since only the actual descriptions of the anchor points were given the writer and her supervisor devised descriptions for the intermediate points, using the same format as Anderson.

The Social Desirability Rating Scale

The Social Desirability Form A and Form B contained identical instructions and scales. The rating scale consisted of a seven-point scale, values being the whole numbers ranging from 0 to 6 inclusive. Subjects were instructed that a 0 rating denoted an unfavorable or socially undesirable value, while a 6 denoted a favorable or socially desirable value. Intermediate points on the scale were not defined. See the appendix for an example of the instructions.

The Meaningfulness Rating Scale

The Meaningfulness rating scale consisted of a five-point scale, values being the whole numbers ranging from 0 to 4 inclusive. Descriptive statements were made about each point on the scale following Anderson's attempt to get a reasonable spread of ratings over the scale (even though the adjectives were already selected for meaningfulness). Oral instructions emphasized the necessity of rating on meaningfulness as trait descriptors only and not on a favorability dimension, since this tendency was strongly noted in Anderson's pilot work on meaningfulness. See the appendix for an example of the instructions.

Scoring

The Social Desirability forms and the Meaningfulness form was scored by each subject placing the rating number in the scale in

a blank placed before each adjective on the form itself. This was done to facilitate scoring by the subject (so he would not lose sight of the word being rated) as well as for ease of compiling data by the researcher.

Treatment of Data

The Social Desirability and the Meaningfulness scale values were collected and analyzed by the writer--all statistical results are reported in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the statistical results of the analysis. All necessary tables are presented and subsequent interpretation of the results are outlined.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The results of each study, that is, the whole numbers given as ratings in both the Social Desirability and the Meaningfulness Study, were directly punched onto computer cards, two cards per subject, the format of the input cards being 5X,75 F 1 . 0 75X, 25 F 1 . 0 . The appropriate Fortran program resulted in a computer output of means (over subjects for each adjective rated) and standard deviations.

Means and Standard Deviations

Eight analyses were performed, with means and standard deviations being calculated for each:

(a) Six analyses on the Social Desirability data--Form A, Males; Form B, Males; Form A, Females; Form B, Females; Form A, Combined Males and Females; and Form B, Combined Males and Females.

(b) Two analyses on the Meaningfulness data--one corresponding to Form A, and one to Form B of the Social Desirability study. Separate analysis of male and female data was not

made.[1]

These eight analyses are recorded in Tables 1 to 8 respectively. The adjective and its number in the study are given in the first column, means over subjects are given in the second column, and standard deviations in the third. Titles of each table give a detailed description of each analysis. Each value is recorded to two significant decimal places.

Comparisons

Social Desirability Data

Since the items for the Social Desirability study (i.e., the adjective trait descriptors) were obtained from previous researches, namely, Norman (1968) and Anderson (1968), Tables 9 to 14 present the comparison of the results of the present research with those of Norman and Anderson, respectively. Means and standard deviations of adjectives common to this research and each of the others are given.[2] The first column of each table gives the variable number (the name of variable can be found in Tables 1 to 6) as corresponds to the present study.

Meaningfulness Data

Meaningfulness scale values obtained in this study are compared to those obtained by Anderson (1968) for adjectives common to

---

[1] Sample size was too small (n = 48).

[2] It might be noted that in Tables 9 to 12, i.e., comparisons of Brodie to Norman, the scales used between the two differ, Brodie's being a seven-point scale, Norman's a nine-point scale. However, comparisons are still possible, with Norman's values being of a greater but comparable magnitude.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A MALE SAMPLE (FORM A), n=56

Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. absent minded	2.41	1.52	51. naive	2.48	1.56
2. anxious	2.66	1.30	52. nonconforming	3.73	1.24
3. artistic	4.14	1.34	53. obedient	3.32	1.47
4. austere	2.80	0.88	54. obliging	3.95	1.30
5. average	3.75	1.48	55. opinionated	3.79	1.46
6. blunt	2.96	1.56	56. orderly	4.07	1.43
7. brisk	3.57	1.43	57. outspoken	3.57	1.37
8. carefree	4.00	1.45	58. particular	3.09	1.43
9. casual	4.20	1.31	59. perfectionistic	2.80	1.68
10. changeable	3.27	1.53	60. persistent	3.63	1.65
11. cocky	2.20	1.57	61. possessive	2.46	1.29
12. complicated	3.25	1.56	62. preoccupied	2.39	1.00
13. compulsive	2.88	1.11	63. proper	3.30	1.28
14. conventional	2.93	1.29	64. quiet	3.82	1.34
15. critical	2.75	1.44	65. rebellious	2.68	1.42
16. cynical	1.86	1.45	66. reserved	3.41	1.14
17. daydreamer	2.79	1.37	67. restless	2.80	1.15
18. definite	4.00	1.38	68. retiring	2.75	1.21
19. demanding	2.57	1.50	69. sad	2.20	1.70
20. dependent	2.91	1.83	70. satirical	3.13	1.64
21. dignified	3.73	1.51	71. secretive	2.21	1.26
22. disciplined	4.18	1.60	72. self-conscious	2.75	1.31
23. discriminating	2.63	2.01	73. self-denying	2.54	1.62
24. distractible	2.36	1.15	74. self-possessed	1.64	1.45
25. eccentric	3.02	1.54	75. self-satisfied	3.48	1.71
26. emphatic	3.45	1.16	76. sentimental	3.80	1.33
27. energetic	4.86	1.07	77. shrewd	3.36	1.57
28. fearful	2.45	1.36	78. silent	3.36	1.10
29. fiery	3.07	1.71	79. skeptical	2.88	1.60
30. forceful	2.98	1.45	80. sophisticated	3.16	1.47
31. formal	2.77	1.54	81. soft-spoken	3.82	1.32
32. frivolous	2.61	1.09	82. spendthrift	2.73	1.27
33. glamorous	3.05	1.63	83. strict	2.55	1.31
34. glib	2.52	1.32	84. suave	2.80	1.26
35. hesitant	2.61	1.09	85. subtle	3.79	1.34
36. idealistic	3.70	1.48	86. talkative	3.27	1.30
37. impartial	3.89	1.56	87. temperamental	2.34	1.42
38. impressionable	3.64	1.18	88. timid	2.88	1.49
39. indecisive	2.02	1.24	89. troubled	2.95	1.60
40. inexact	2.13	1.28	90. unassuming	3.00	1.48
41. inhibited	2.09	1.27	91. uncompetative	2.05	1.48
42. inoffensive	3.46	1.44	92. undecided	2.46	1.36
43. irreligious	3.20	1.52	93. unhappy	2.46	1.62
44. leisurely	3.95	1.47	94. unoriginal	1.91	1.20
45. lucky	3.70	1.36	95. unpoised	2.05	1.23
46. materialistic	2.96	1.54	96. unromantic	2.05	1.43
47. meditative	3.23	1.49	97. unskilled	2.48	1.31
48. meticulous	3.00	1.28	98. unsuspicious	3.45	1.45
49. mild	4.05	1.26	99. wary	2.88	1.42
50. moody	2.04	1.40	100. withdrawn	2.18	1.43

TABLE 2
SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A MALE SAMPLE (FORM B), n=65

Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. aggressive	3.05	1.34	51. old-fashioned	2.18	1.31
2. argumentative	2.51	1.42	52. opportunist	3.20	1.62
3. assertive	2.89	1.28	53. ordinary	3.23	1.46
4. authoritative	3.48	1.70	54. painstaking	2.94	1.62
5. bashful	3.11	1.25	55. passive	2.98	1.29
6. acquiescent	2.97	1.00	56. persuasive	3.78	1.49
7. calculating	3.03	1.56	57. philosophical	3.66	1.35
8. careful	4.29	1.31	58. precise	3.94	1.34
9. cautious	3.72	1.33	59. prideful	3.32	1.74
10. choosy	2.57	1.55	60. protective	3.51	1.54
11. controlled	4.28	1.58	61. prudent	2.69	1.59
12. coy	2.97	1.36	62. radical	2.55	1.54
13. conservative	3.17	1.28	63. religious	2.98	1.59
14. crafty	2.63	1.64	64. resigned	2.12	1.49
15. cunning	2.75	1.71	65. restrained	2.71	1.20
16. daring	3.97	1.32	66. ritualistic	2.15	1.39
17. defensive	3.00	1.36	67. sarcastic	1.91	1.75
18. deliberative	3.12	1.28	68. scientific	3.40	1.40
19. demonstrative	2.88	1.63	69. self-concerned	2.35	1.55
20. devout	3.63	1.64	70. self-critical	3.68	1.50
21. direct	4.51	1.44	71. self-indulgent	2.38	1.52
22. discontented	2.08	1.44	72. self-righteous	2.02	1.34
23. dissatisfied	2.03	1.47	73. sensitive	4.15	1.48
24. dogged	2.17	1.44	74. serious	3.97	1.46
25. emotional	3.32	1.43	75. shy	3.58	1.30
26. excitable	3.63	1.38	76. silly	2.34	1.51
27. fashionable	4.14	1.42	77. sociable	5.15	0.87
28. fierce	2.00	1.44	78. soft-hearted	4.40	1.50
29. flirtatious	2.46	1.58	79. somber	2.66	1.35
30. forgetful	2.46	1.53	80. stern	2.35	1.24
31. forward	3.72	1.31	81. stubborn	2.11	1.57
32. gullible	2.08	1.56	82. studious	3.51	1.30
33. high-strung	1.89	1.53	83. submissive	2.60	1.30
34. immodest	2.03	1.65	84. suggestible	3.38	1.25
35. impractical	2.09	1.42	85. teetotaler	1.77	1.48
36. impulsive	3.00	1.51	86. tense	2.26	1.30
37. indifferent	2.31	1.53	87. tough	2.32	1.57
38. inexperienced	3.00	1.27	88. unadventurous	1.50	1.36
39. innocent	3.52	1.43	89. unbending	1.76	1.60
40. intense	3.60	1.48	90. uncultured	1.68	1.39
41. jaunty	3.11	1.30	91. ungraceful	1.77	1.46
42. lonely	3.15	1.57	92. unhurried	3.37	1.28
43. mathematical	2.54	1.42	93. unpredictable	3.11	1.48
44. meek	2.42	1.57	94. unpopular	2.22	1.36
45. methodical	3.34	1.31	95. unshakeable	2.94	1.75
46. moderate	3.49	1.39	96. unsystematic	2.48	1.31
47. moralistic	2.82	1.64	97. willful	3.63	1.39
48. nonchalant	3.52	1.40	98. wordy	2.51	1.43
49. normal	4.03	1.56	99. worrier	2.23	1.39
50. objective	3.78	1.63	100. worldly	3.49	1.68

TABLE 3
SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM A), n=68

Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. absent minded	2.62	1.23	51. naive	2.68	1.52
2. anxious	2.59	1.33	52. nonconforming	3.53	1.53
3. artistic	4.56	1.16	53. obedient	3.36	1.31
4. austere	2.63	1.54	54. obliging	4.50	1.41
5. average	3.43	1.46	55. opinionated	3.49	1.60
6. blunt	3.31	1.37	56. orderly	3.79	1.55
7. brisk	2.90	1.36	57. outspoken	3.21	1.43
8. carefree	4.24	1.28	58. particular	3.10	1.46
9. casual	4.13	1.50	59. perfectionistic	2.97	1.78
10. changeable	3.06	1.51	60. persistent	3.26	1.29
11. cocky	2.12	1.66	61. possessive	2.61	1.68
12. complicated	3.28	1.68	62. preoccupied	2.00	1.26
13. compulsive	3.46	1.53	63. proper	2.68	1.49
14. conventional	2.83	1.31	64. quiet	3.22	1.37
15. critical	2.28	1.33	65. rebellious	2.56	1.44
16. cynical	1.81	1.63	66. reserved	2.99	1.34
17. daydreamer	2.66	1.47	67. restless	2.54	1.16
18. definite	4.38	1.48	68. retiring	2.18	1.39
19. demanding	2.41	1.66	69. sad	1.85	1.43
20. dependent	2.88	1.83	70. satirical	2.44	1.71
21. dignified	4.00	1.55	71. secretive	1.91	1.44
22. disciplined	4.25	1.29	72. self-conscious	2.62	1.57
23. discriminating	2.76	1.12	73. self-denying	2.38	1.59
24. distractible	2.19	1.19	74. self-possessed	1.63	1.66
25. eccentric	3.00	1.66	75. self-satisfied	3.76	1.94
26. emphatic	3.68	1.43	76. sentimental	4.31	1.30
27. energetic	4.75	1.29	77. shrewd	2.85	1.76
28. fearful	1.97	1.30	78. silent	2.37	1.42
29. fiery	3.03	1.70	79. skeptical	2.35	1.23
30. forceful	3.00	1.56	80. sophisticated	3.03	1.51
31. formal	2.18	1.41	81. soft-spoken	3.90	1.58
32. frivolous	2.49	1.75	82. spendthrift	2.41	1.32
33. glamorous	2.78	1.38	83. strict	2.26	1.36
34. glib	2.16	1.44	84. suave	2.54	1.64
35. hesitant	2.53	1.10	85. subtle	3.82	1.52
36. idealistic	3.62	1.55	86. talkative	3.90	1.43
37. impartial	3.04	1.66	87. temperamental	2.07	1.46
38. impressionable	3.28	1.44	88. timid	2.14	1.31
39. indecisive	1.90	1.34	89. troubled	2.38	1.13
40. inexact	2.04	1.30	90. unassuming	3.18	1.75
41. inhibited	2.18	1.49	91. uncompetative	2.50	1.66
42. inoffensive	3.81	1.64	92. undecided	1.90	1.08
43. irreligious	3.13	1.71	93. unhappy	1.80	1.36
44. leisurely	3.94	1.40	94. unoriginal	1.68	1.37
45. lucky	3.47	1.63	95. unpoised	2.06	1.28
46. materialistic	2.54	1.71	96. unromantic	1.75	1.45
47. meditative	3.71	1.48	97. unskilled	2.43	1.52
48. meticulous	3.26	1.59	98. unsuspicious	3.60	1.75
49. mild	3.18	1.44	99. wary	2.65	1.49
50. moody	1.85	1.56	100. withdrawn	2.09	1.64

TABLE 4
SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM B), n=65

Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. aggressive	2.94	1.50	51. old-fashioned	2.86	1.41
2. argumentative	2.14	1.34	52. opportunist	3.31	1.78
3. assertive	3.31	1.41	53. ordinary	3.42	1.48
4. authoritative	2.85	1.44	54. painstaking	3.11	1.30
5. bashful	2.85	1.21	55. passive	2.20	1.43
6. acquiescent	2.80	1.18	56. persuasive	3.65	1.10
7. calculating	2.31	1.44	57. philosophical	3.97	1.45
8. careful	3.98	1.28	58. precise	3.83	1.36
9. cautious	3.77	1.28	59. prideful	3.26	1.88
10. choosy	2.69	1.39	60. protective	3.98	1.54
11. controlled	4.08	1.53	61. prudent	3.00	1.40
12. coy	2.22	1.36	62. radical	2.72	1.38
13. conservative	3.02	1.23	63. religious	3.53	1.53
14. crafty	2.04	1.76	64. resigned	1.98	1.30
15. cunning	2.34	1.65	65. restrained	2.46	1.30
16. daring	3.66	1.40	66. ritualistic	2.02	1.48
17. defensive	2.80	1.38	67. sarcastic	1.85	1.61
18. deliberative	3.14	1.31	68. scientific	3.23	1.33
19. demonstrative	3.52	1.48	69. self-concerned	2.40	1.84
20. devout	3.58	1.67	70. self-critical	2.72	1.54
21. direct	4.83	1.07	71. self-indulgent	2.34	1.46
22. discontented	1.98	1.23	72. self-righteous	1.95	1.66
23. dissatisfied	1.91	1.11	73. sensitive	4.51	1.31
24. dogged	2.05	1.59	74. serious	3.98	1.08
25. emotional	3.31	1.27	75. shy	3.31	1.25
26. excitable	3.68	1.05	76. silly	2.25	1.66
27. fashionable	3.80	1.37	77. sociable	4.83	1.36
28. fierce	1.94	1.36	78. soft-hearted	4.86	1.09
29. flirtatious	1.92	1.55	79. somber	2.68	1.33
30. forgetful	2.15	1.24	80. stern	2.51	1.19
31. forward	3.13	1.52	81. stubborn	2.49	1.37
32. gullible	2.46	1.40	82. studious	3.62	1.23
33. high-strung	2.00	1.30	83. submissive	1.94	1.04
34. immodest	1.82	1.50	84. suggestible	2.78	1.33
35. impractical	2.09	1.35	85. teetotaler	2.54	1.70
36. impulsive	3.42	1.43	86. tense	2.14	1.00
37. indifferent	1.68	1.55	87. tough	2.22	1.71
38. inexperienced	2.94	1.24	88. unadventurous	1.25	1.13
39. innocent	3.80	1.25	89. unbending	1.54	1.38
40. intense	3.86	1.43	90. uncultured	1.98	1.30
41. jaunty	3.69	1.62	91. ungraceful	2.43	1.22
42. lonely	3.62	1.38	92. unhurried	3.52	1.55
43. mathematical	2.94	1.53	93. unpredictable	3.31	1.45
44. meek	2.71	1.62	94. unpopular	2.51	1.29
45. methodical	3.29	1.47	95. unshakeable	3.14	1.41
46. moderate	4.03	1.36	96. unsystematic	2.49	1.23
47. moralistic	3.12	1.83	97. willful	3.39	1.39
48. nonchalant	3.51	1.67	98. wordy	2.46	1.32
49. normal	3.89	1.83	99. worrier	2.25	1.36
50. objective	4.20	1.35	100. worldly	3.52	1.98

TABLE 5

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM A), n=124

Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form A, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. absent minded	2.52	1.37	51. naive	2.59	1.54
2. anxious	2.62	1.31	52. nonconformist	3.62	1.41
3. artistic	4.37	1.26	53. obedient	3.34	1.38
4. austere	2.70	1.29	54. obliging	4.25	1.39
5. average	3.57	1.47	55. opinionated	3.62	1.54
6. blunt	3.15	1.47	56. orderly	3.92	1.50
7. brisk	3.20	1.43	57. outspoken	3.37	1.41
8. carefree	4.13	1.36	58. particular	3.10	1.44
9. casual	4.16	1.41	59. perfectionistic	2.90	1.73
10. changeable	3.15	1.52	60. persistent	3.43	1.47
11. cocky	2.15	1.61	61. possessive	2.55	1.51
12. complicated	2.27	1.62	62. preoccupied	2.18	1.16
13. compulsive	3.19	1.38	63. proper	2.96	1.43
14. conventional	2.87	1.30	64. quiet	3.49	1.38
15. critical	2.49	1.40	65. rebellious	2.61	1.43
16. cynical	1.83	1.54	66. reserved	3.18	1.27
17. daydreamer	2.72	1.42	67. restless	2.66	1.16
18. definite	4.21	1.44	68. retiring	2.44	1.34
19. demanding	2.48	1.58	69. sad	2.01	1.56
20. dependent	2.90	1.82	70. satirical	2.75	1.71
21. dignified	3.85	1.53	71. secretive	2.05	1.37
22. disciplined	4.22	1.43	72. self-conscious	2.68	1.46
23. discriminating	2.70	2.07	73. self-denying	2.45	1.60
24. distractible	2.27	1.17	74. self-possessed	1.64	1.56
25. eccentric	2.98	1.60	75. self-satisfied	3.64	1.84
26. emphatic	3.57	1.31	76. sentimental	4.08	1.33
27. energetic	4.80	1.19	77. shrewd	3.08	1.69
28. fearful	2.19	1.35	78. silent	2.81	1.38
29. fiery	3.05	1.70	79. skeptical	2.59	1.22
30. forceful	2.99	1.51	80. sophisticated	3.09	1.49
31. formal	2.44	1.49	81. soft-spoken	3.86	1.47
32. frivolous	2.54	1.48	82. spendthrift	2.56	1.30
33. glamorous	2.90	1.50	83. strict	2.40	1.34
34. glib	2.32	1.39	84. suave	2.66	1.48
35. hesitant	2.56	1.09	85. subtle	3.81	1.44
36. idealistic	3.65	1.51	86. talkative	3.61	1.40
37. impartial	3.43	1.66	87. temperamental	2.19	1.44
38. impressionable	3.44	1.34	88. timid	2.48	1.43
39. indecisive	1.95	1.29	89. troubled	2.64	1.39
40. inexact	2.08	1.29	90. unassuming	3.10	1.63
41. inhibited	2.14	1.39	91. uncompetative	2.30	1.59
42. inoffensive	3.65	1.56	92. undecided	2.15	1.24
43. irreligious	3.16	1.62	93. unhappy	2.10	1.51
44. leisurely	3.94	1.43	94. unoriginal	1.78	1.29
45. lucky	3.57	1.52	95. unpoised	2.06	1.25
46. materialistic	2.73	1.64	96. unromantic	1.89	1.44
47. meditative	3.49	1.50	97. unskilled	2.45	1.42
48. meticulous	3.14	1.46	98. unsuspicious	3.53	1.62
49. mild	3.57	1.43	99. wary	2.75	1.46
50. moody	1.94	1.49	100. withdrawn	2.13	1.54

TABLE 6
SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM B), n=130

Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. aggressive	2.99	1.42	51. old-fashioned	2.52	1.40
2. argumentative	2.32	1.39	52. opportunist	2.25	1.70
3. assertive	3.10	1.36	53. ordinary	3.32	1.46
4. authoritative	2.66	1.58	54. painstaking	3.02	1.47
5. bashful	2.98	1.24	55. passive	2.59	1.41
6. acquiescent	2.88	1.09	56. persuasive	3.72	1.31
7. calculating	2.67	1.54	57. philosophical	3.82	1.40
8. careful	4.14	1.30	58. precise	3.88	1.35
9. cautious	3.75	1.30	59. prideful	3.29	1.81
10. choosy	2.63	1.47	60. protective	3.75	1.55
11. controlled	4.18	1.55	61. prudent	2.85	1.50
12. coy	2.59	1.41	62. radical	2.64	1.46
13. conservative	3.09	1.25	63. religious	3.17	1.56
14. crafty	2.34	1.72	64. resigned	2.05	1.40
15. cunning	2.55	1.68	65. restrained	2.58	1.25
16. daring	3.82	1.36	66. ritualistic	2.08	1.44
17. defensive	2.90	1.37	67. sarcastic	1.88	1.68
18. deliberative	3.13	1.29	68. scientific	3.32	1.36
19. demonstrative	3.20	1.58	69. self-concerned	2.38	1.69
20. devout	3.61	1.64	70. self-critical	3.20	1.59
21. direct	4.67	1.27	71. self-indulgent	2.36	1.48
22. discontented	2.03	1.33	72. self-righteous	1.98	1.50
23. dissatisfied	1.97	1.30	73. sensitive	4.33	1.41
24. dogged	2.11	1.51	74. serious	3.98	1.28
25. emotional	3.32	1.35	75. shy	3.45	1.28
26. excitable	3.65	1.22	76. silly	2.29	1.58
27. fashionable	3.97	1.40	77. sociable	4.99	1.15
28. fierce	1.97	1.39	78. soft-hearted	4.63	1.32
29. flirtatious	2.19	1.59	79. somber	2.67	1.24
30. forgetful	3.31	1.40	80. stern	2.43	1.21
31. forward	3.43	1.44	81. stubborn	2.30	1.48
32. gullible	2.27	1.49	82. studious	3.56	1.26
33. high-strung	1.95	1.42	83. submissive	2.27	1.22
34. immodest	1.92	1.58	84. suggestible	3.08	1.32
35. impractical	2.09	1.38	85. teetotaler	2.15	1.63
36. impulsive	3.21	1.48	86. tense	2.20	1.16
37. indifferent	1.99	1.57	87. tough	2.27	1.64
38. inexperienced	2.97	1.25	88. unadventurous	1.38	1.25
39. innocent	3.66	1.34	89. unbending	1.65	1.49
40. intense	3.73	1.46	90. uncultured	1.83	1.35
41. jaunty	3.40	1.49	91. ungraceful	2.10	1.38
42. lonely	3.38	1.49	92. unhurried	3.45	1.42
43. mathematical	2.74	1.48	93. unpredictable	3.21	1.46
44. meek	2.56	1.59	94. unpopular	2.36	1.33
45. methodical	3.32	1.39	95. unshakeable	3.04	1.59
46. moderate	3.76	1.40	96. unsystematic	2.48	1.27
47. moralistic	2.97	1.74	97. willful	3.51	1.39
48. nonchalant	3.52	1.54	98. wordy	2.48	1.37
49. normal	3.96	1.70	99. worrier	2.24	1.37
50. objective	3.99	1.51	100. worldly	3.51	1.83

TABLE 7
MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM A), n=48

FORM A, VARIABLE NO AND NAME	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS	FORM A, VARIABLE NO AND NAME	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
1. absent-minded	3.67	0.56	51. naive	3.56	0.74
2. anxious	3.54	0.71	52. nonconforming	3.56	0.77
3. artistic	3.02	1.06	53. obedient	3.63	0.82
4. austere	1.35	1.10	54. obliging	3.48	0.71
5. average	2.71	1.24	55. opinionated	3.54	0.94
6. blunt	3.48	0.87	56. orderly	3.52	0.77
7. brisk	2.85	1.34	57. outspoken	3.65	0.70
8. carefree	3.63	0.61	58. particular	3.10	1.10
9. casual	3.27	0.92	59. perfectionistic	3.75	0.53
10. changeable	3.52	0.97	60. persistent	3.67	0.69
11. cocky	3.00	1.29	61. possessive	3.75	0.53
12. complicated	3.27	0.94	62. preoccupied	3.35	1.02
13. compulsive	3.38	0.94	63. proper	2.79	1.27
14. conventional	3.19	0.89	64. quiet	3.73	0.54
15. critical	3.54	0.65	65. rebellious	3.44	0.74
16. cynical	3.33	0.83	66. reserved	3.65	0.56
17. daydreamer	3.60	0.74	67. restless	3.56	0.80
18. definite	3.02	1.21	68. retiring	2.52	1.29
19. demanding	3.46	0.85	69. sad	3.29	0.94
20. dependent	3.58	0.68	70. satirical	2.98	1.02
21. dignified	3.15	1.09	71. secretive	3.15	1.09
22. disciplined	3.33	0.81	72. self-conscious	3.75	0.56
23. discriminating	3.90	1.08	73. self-denying	3.02	1.14
24. distractible	2.75	1.21	74. self-possessed	2.77	1.37
25. eccentric	2.85	1.07	75. self-satisfied	3.13	0.98
26. emphatic	2.85	1.24	76. sentimental	3.38	0.70
27. energetic	3.67	0.66	77. shrewd	3.19	0.91
28. fearful	3.21	1.13	78. silent	3.15	1.24
29. fiery	2.96	1.20	79. skeptical	3.35	0.89
30. forceful	3.40	0.89	80. sophisticated	3.10	0.88
31. formal	3.29	0.80	81. soft-spoken	3.48	0.87
32. frivolous	3.08	1.01	82. spendthrift	3.02	1.19
33. glamorous	3.92	1.13	83. strict	3.50	0.83
34. glib	1.85	1.47	84. suave	2.65	1.31
35. hesitant	3.40	0.89	85. subtle	3.13	1.08
36. idealistic	3.48	0.90	86. talkative	3.73	0.76
37. impartial	3.19	1.18	87. temperamental	3.52	0.85
38. impressionable	3.06	1.21	88. timid	3.75	0.56
39. indecisive	3.58	0.68	89. troubled	3.25	0.84
40. inexact	2.96	1.13	90. unassuming	2.67	1.04
41. inhibited	3.67	0.52	91. uncompetative	3.08	1.07
42. inoffensive	2.88	1.04	92. undecided	3.10	1.22
43. irreligious	2.46	1.30	93. unhappy	3.50	0.85
44. leisurely	3.13	0.98	94. unoriginal	3.15	1.24
45. lucky	3.35	1.06	95. unpoised	2.69	1.26
46. materialistic	3.73	0.64	96. unromantic	3.23	0.95
47. meditative	3.10	0.97	97. unskilled	3.31	1.09
48. meticulous	3.40	0.98	98. unsuspicious	3.21	0.85
49. mild	3.08	0.98	99. wary	3.19	1.12
50. moody	3.71	0.50	100. withdrawn	3.63	0.79

TABLE 8

MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES ON SELECTED ADJECTIVE TRAIT DESCRIPTORS FOR A COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLE (FORM B), n=48

Form B, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations	Form, Variable No and Name	Means	Standard Deviations
1. aggressive	3.67	0.69	51. old-fashioned	2.90	0.94
2. argumentative	3.63	0.64	52. opportunist	3.23	0.95
3. assertive	3.08	1.05	53. ordinary	3.21	1.30
4. authoritative	3.63	0.57	54. painstaking	2.88	1.12
5. bashful	3.56	0.82	55. passive	3.20	0.74
6. acquiescent	1.90	1.42	56. persuasive	2.98	0.50
7. calculating	3.02	1.12	57. philosophical	3.69	0.70
8. careful	3.42	0.99	58. precise	3.19	0.80
9. cautious	3.67	0.63	59. prideful	3.38	0.87
10. choosy	3.38	0.94	60. protective	3.54	0.82
11. controlled	3.19	0.87	61. prudent	3.31	0.83
12. coy	2.56	1.20	62. radical	2.81	0.93
13. conservative	3.31	0.95	63. religious	3.67	1.11
14. crafty	3.38	0.98	64. resigned	3.75	1.02
15. cunning	3.46	0.77	65. restrained	3.88	0.87
16. daring	3.46	0.85	66. ritualistic	3.06	0.98
17. defensive	3.56	0.65	67. sarcastic	3.60	0.62
18. deliberative	2.96	0.99	68. scientific	3.52	1.08
19. demonstrative	3.02	1.10	69. self-concerned	2.73	0.84
20. devout	3.08	1.20	70. self-critical	3.35	0.71
21. direct	3.10	1.10	71. self-indulgent	3.31	0.97
22. discontented	3.40	0.87	72. self-righteous	2.81	1.25
23. dissatisfied	3.54	0.71	73. sensitive	3.67	0.56
24. dogged	1.71	1.35	74. serious	3.75	0.53
25. emotional	3.58	0.77	75. shy	3.88	0.39
26. excitable	3.63	0.67	76. silly	3.06	1.06
27. fashionable	3.21	1.09	77. sociable	3.60	0.79
28. fierce	3.08	1.18	78. soft-hearted	3.52	0.65
29. flirtatious	3.33	0.78	79. somber	2.73	0.96
30. forgetful	3.79	0.65	80. stern	3.35	0.91
31. forward	3.58	0.68	81. stubborn	3.79	0.41
32. gullible	3.56	0.87	82. studious	3.73	0.49
33. high-strung	3.25	1.14	83. submissive	3.58	0.61
34. immodest	3.12	0.98	84. suggestible	2.92	1.05
35. impractical	3.56	0.80	85. teetotaler	2.67	1.58
36. impulsive	3.63	0.67	86. tense	3.33	0.86
37. indifferent	3.31	1.09	87. tough	3.18	0.98
38. inexperienced	3.40	1.09	88. unadventurous	3.17	1.08
39. innocent	3.38	0.98	89. unbending	3.35	1.04
40. intense	3.35	0.84	90. uncultured	2.75	1.31
41. jaunty	2.10	1.31	91. ungraceful	2.90	1.29
42. lonely	3.52	0.95	92. unhurried	3.31	1.07
43. mathematical	3.02	1.18	93. unpredictable	3.73	0.49
44. meek	3.27	0.84	94. unpopular	3.31	1.01
45. methodical	3.40	0.92	95. unshakeable	3.14	0.92
46. moderate		1.12	96. unsystematic	3.31	0.90
47. moralistic	3.23	0.93	97. willful	3.04	1.01
48. nonchalant	3.13	1.00	98. wordy	3.25	1.08
49. normal	2.60	1.25	99. worrier	3.63	0.73
50. objective	3.02	1.10	100. worldly	2.94	1.12

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM A, MALES, n=56) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM NORMAN (1968) ON A MALE SAMPLE, n=50

Form A, Variable No.	Brodie		Norman	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
4.	2.80	0.88	4.63	1.92
7.	3.57	1.43	5.92	1.71
8.	4.00	1.45	6.10	1.58
9.	4.20	1.31	6.68	1.33
10.	3.27	1.53	4.96	1.47
11.	2.20	1.57	3.52	1.90
12.	3.25	1.56	5.18	1.61
14.	2.93	1.29	4.06	1.62
15.	2.75	1.44	5.28	1.79
16.	1.86	1.45	3.86	1.85
10.	2.91	1.83	4.16	2.49
24.	2.36	1.15	3.40	1.40
26.	3.45	1.16	6.24	1.30
27.	4.86	1.07	7.55	1.03
30.	2.98	1.45	6.08	1.75
31.	2.77	1.54	5.02	1.76
33.	3.05	1.63	6.22	1.38
34.	2.52	1.32	4.37	1.75
37.	3.89	1.56	6.46	1.92
38.	3.64	1.18	5.02	1.61
40.	2.13	1.28	3.86	0.99
41.	2.09	1.27	3.60	1.69
44.	3.95	1.47	5.38	1.60
46.	2.96	1.54	4.82	1.51
49.	4.05	1.26	6.46	1.59
50.	2.04	1.40	3.86	1.59
51.	2.48	1.56	3.10	1.46
52.	3.73	1.24	5.44	1.42
54.	3.95	1.30	6.30	1.40
55.	3.79	1.46	4.84	2.18
57.	3.57	1.37	5.56	1.61
58.	3.09	1.43	6.50	1.33
59.	2.80	1.68	5.70	1.89
61.	2.46	1.29	4.27	1.69
63.	3.30	1.28	5.76	1.66
64.	3.82	1.34	5.33	1.24
65.	2.68	1.42	4.88	1.79
66.	3.41	1.14	5.28	1.54
68.	2.75	1.21	4.25	1.27
71.	2.21	1.26	3.69	1.33
74.	1.64	1.45	4.02	2.29
75.	3.48	1.71	5.56	2.28
76.	3.80	1.33	6.08	1.76
77.	3.36	1.57	5.94	2.02
78.	3.36	1.10	3.96	1.41
79.	2.88	1.60	4.86	1.65
82.	2.73	1.27	4.12	1.73
83.	2.55	1.31	4.43	1.60
84.	2.80	1.26	6.44	1.34
86.	3.27	1.30	5.36	1.28
87.	2.34	1.42	4.20	1.84
88.	2.88	1.49	3.22	1.17
90.	3.00	1.48	5.35	1.73
91.	2.05	1.48	3.48	1.65
98.	3.45	1.45	5.70	1.55
99.	2.88	1.42	6.13	1.41

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM B, MALES, n=65) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM NORMAN (1968) ON A MALE SAMPLE, n=50

Form B Variable No.	Brodie		Norman	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	3.05	1.34	6.10	1.58
2.	2.51	1.42	4.12	1.82
3.	2.89	1.28	6.52	1.64
5.	3.11	1.25	3.72	1.28
6.	2.97	1.00	5.11	1.63
7.	3.03	1.56	6.26	1.61
9.	3.72	1.33	6.58	1.54
11.	4.28	1.58	6.74	1.69
12.	2.97	1.36	5.18	1.61
14.	2.63	1.64	5.26	2.09
15.	2.75	1.71	5.69	1.82
16.	3.97	1.32	7.00	1.13
18.	3.12	1.28	6.60	1.34
19.	2.88	1.63	5.73	1.70
20.	3.63	1.64	5.71	1.77
24.	2.17	1.44	4.74	1.97
25.	3.32	1.43	5.48	1.53
26.	3.63	1.38	5.30	1.84
28.	2.00	1.44	4.42	1.92
29.	2.46	1.58	4.92	1.90
32.	1.08	1.56	3.10	1.50
33.	1.89	1.53	3.26	1.69
35.	2.09	1.42	3.02	1.49
38.	3.00	1.27	3.92	1.21
40.	3.	1.48	6.02	1.29
41.	3.11	1.30	6.04	1.44
44.	2.42	1.57	4.06	1.38
45.	3.34	1.31	6.10	1.46
52.	3.20	1.62	5.60	2.11
58.	3.94	1.34	7.35	1.19
60.	3.51	1.54	6.06	1.64
65.	2.71	1.20	5.24	1.32
66.	2.15	1.39	3.65	1.27
67.	1.91	1.75	4.61	1.68
71.	2.38	1.52	4.63	1.78
72.	2.02	1.34	5.12	2.31
75.	3.58	1.30	4.08	1.21
77.	5.15	0.87	7.56	1.15
79.	2.66	1.35	4.90	1.34
80.	2.35	1.24	4.66	1.73
81.	2.11	1.57	3.84	1.38
82.	3.51	1.30	6.46	1.47
83.	2.60	1.30	3.32	1.24
84.	3.38	1.25	5.13	1.53
85.	1.77	1.48	4.11	1.96
89.	1.76	1.60	4.19	1.84
92.	3.37	1.28	6.06	1.35
93.	3.11	1.48	4.68	1.46
95.	2.94	1.75	5.32	1.96
96.	2.48	1.31	3.44	1.14
97.	3.63	1.39	6.50	1.34
100.	3.49	1.68	6.58	1.71

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM A, FEMALES, n=68) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM NORMAN (1968) ON A FEMALE SAMPLE, n=50

Form A Variable No.	Brodie		Norman	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
4.	2.63	1.54	4.04	1.96
7.	2.90	1.36	5.12	1.49
8.	4.24	1.28	6.32	1.47
9.	4.13	1.50	6.46	1.14
10.	3.06	1.51	5.32	1.52
11.	2.12	1.66	3.61	2.21
12.	3.28	1.68	5.88	1.53
14.	2.83	1.31	4.54	1.71
15.	2.28	1.33	4.43	1.81
16.	1.81	1.63	3.46	2.06
20.	2.88	1.83	4.42	2.15
24.	2.19	1.19	3.60	1.16
26.	3.68	1.43	6.22	1.22
27.	4.75	1.29	8.02	0.84
30.	3.00	1.56	6.16	1.50
31.	2.18	1.41	4.80	1.59
33.	2.78	1.38	6.36	1.05
34.	2.16	1.44	4.96	1.96
37.	3.04	1.66	5.92	2.14
38.	3.28	1.44	5.14	1.17
40.	2.04	1.30	3.66	1.16
41.	2.18	1.49	3.61	1.59
44.	3.94	1.40	5.60	1.57
46.	2.54	1.71	3.59	1.81
49.	3.18	1.44	6.02	1.45
50.	1.85	1.56	3.86	1.71
51.	2.68	1.52	4.08	1.66
52.	3.53	1.53	6.06	1.71
54.	4.50	1.41	6.54	1.63
55.	3.49	1.60	3.96	2.20
57.	3.21	1.43	5.02	1.96
58.	3.10	1.46	6.22	1.74
59.	2.97	1.78	5.92	1.72
61.	2.61	1.68	3.60	1.17
63.	2.68	1.49	5.52	1.82
64.	3.22	1.37	5.70	1.36
65.	2.56	1.44	4.66	1.76
66.	2.99	1.34	5.30	1.60
68.	2.18	1.39	4.14	0.98
71.	1.91	1.44	3.92	1.80
74.	1.63	1.66	4.22	2.92
75.	3.76	1.94	6.45	1.77
76.	4.31	1.30	5.78	1.30
77.	2.85	1.76	5.20	1.70
78.	2.37	1.42	4.44	1.49
79.	2.35	1.23	5.10	1.75
82.	2.41	1.32	3.70	1.42
83.	2.26	1.36	4.30	1.65
84.	2.54	1.64	6.14	1.65
86.	3.90	1.43	5.32	1.55
87.	2.07	1.46	3.78	1.81
88.	2.14	1.31	3.77	1.31
90.	3.18	1.75	5.94	1.89
91.	2.50	1.66	4.30	1.58
98.	3.60	1.75	5.78	1.45
99.	2.65	1.49	5.06	1.63

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM B, FEMALES, n=65) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM NORMAN (1968) ON A FEMALE SAMPLE, n=50

Form B Variable No.	Brodie		Norman	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	2.94	1.50	4.62	1.97
2.	2.14	1.34	3.98	1.62
3.	3.31	1.41	5.82	1.53
5.	2.85	1.21	4.60	1.00
6.	2.80	1.18	4.95	1.49
7.	2.31	1.44	5.02	1.68
9.	3.77	1.28	6.52	1.36
11.	4.08	1.53	6.30	1.97
12.	2.22	1.36	5.16	1.59
14.	2.04	1.76	4.04	2.16
15.	2.34	1.65	4.64	1.96
16.	3.66	1.40	6.40	1.30
18.	3.14	1.31	6.10	1.61
19.	3.52	1.48	5.73	1.96
20.	3.58	1.67	6.22	1.80
24.	2.05	1.59	4.28	2.15
25.	3.31	1.27	5.72	1.83
26.	3.68	1.05	5.86	1.52
28.	1.94	1.36	3.78	1.83
29.	1.92	1.55	4.80	1.52
32.	2.46	1.40	3.90	1.42
33.	2.00	1.30	3.72	1.81
35.	2.09	1.35	3.52	1.32
38.	2.94	1.24	3.82	1.19
40.	3.86	1.43	6.17	1.67
41.	3.69	1.62	5.87	1.71
44.	2.71	1.62	3.80	1.83
45.	3.29	1.47	5.52	1.57
52.	3.31	1.78	4.73	2.21
58.	3.83	1.36	6.52	1.59
60.	3.98	1.54	6.08	1.78
65.	2.46	1.30	5.18	1.48
66.	2.02	1.48	3.78	1.50
67.	1.85	1.61	4.29	1.70
71.	2.34	1.46	3.53	1.74
72.	1.95	1.66	4.31	2.55
75.	3.31	1.25	4.38	1.18
77.	4.83	1.36	7.46	1.27
79.	2.68	1.33	4.73	1.55
80.	2.51	1.19	4.27	1.51
81.	2.49	1.37	3.68	1.53
82.	3.62	1.23	6.94	1.16
83.	1.94	1.04	3.69	1.51
84.	2.78	1.33	5.16	1.65
85.	2.54	1.70	3.77	1.64
89.	1.54	1.38	3.68	1.82
92.	3.52	1.55	5.56	1.32
93.	3.31	1.45	5.58	1.69
95.	3.14	1.41	5.24	1.68
96.	2.49	1.23	4.04	1.50
97.	3.39	1.39	5.78	2.05
100.	3.52	1.98	6.10	1.88

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM A, COMBINED MALES AND FEMALES, n=124) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM ANDERSON (1968) ON A COMBINED SAMPLE OF MALES AND FEMALES, n=100

Form A, Variable No.	Brodie		Anderson	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	2.52	1.37	2.13	1.00
2.	2.62	1.31	2.46	0.95
3.	4.37	1.26	4.00	1.26
5.	3.57	1.47	2.84	0.95
6.	3.15	1.47	2.87	1.28
10.	3.15	1.52	2.97	1.04
13.	3.19	1.38	2.05	1.10
14.	2.87	1.30	2.60	0.98
15.	2.49	1.40	2.43	1.21
17	2.72	1.42	2.60	0.98
18.	4.21	1.44	3.75	0.87
19.	2.48	1.58	2.03	0.97
20.	2.90	1.82	2.54	1.40
21.	3.85	1.53	3.86	1.02
22.	4.22	1.43	3.79	1.11
23.	2.70	2.07	2.83	1.87
25.	2.98	1.60	2.57	1.26
28.	2.19	1.35	2.14	0.83
30.	2.99	1.64	2.63	1.28
32.	2.54	1.48	2.37	1.24
35.	2.56	1.09	2.90	0.87
36.	3.65	1.51	3.84	1.16
38.	3.44	1.34	2.66	0.95
39.	1.95	1.29	2.19	0.95
41.	2.14	1.39	2.24	0.93
42.	3.65	1.56	3.32	0.35
43.	3.16	1.62	2.34	1.32
45.	3.57	1.52	3.58	1.14
46.	2.73	1.64	2.60	1.29
47.	3.49	1.50	3.66	1.23
48.	3.14	1.46	3.46	1.17
51.	2.59	1.54	2.70	1.03
52.	3.62	1.41	3.69	1.15
53.	3.34	1.38	3.73	1.29
54.	4.25	1.39	3.89	1.24
55.	3.62	1.54	2.57	1.41
56.	3.92	1.50	3.93	0.92
57.	3.37	1.41	3.13	1.33
59.	2.90	1.73	3.22	1.30
60.	3.43	1.47	3.47	1.29
62.	2.18	1.16	2.16	1.06
64.	3.49	1.38	3.11	0.95
65.	2.61	1.43	2.58	1.18
66.	3.18	1.27	3.48	1.00
67.	2.66	1.16	2.74	0.87
69.	2.01	1.56	2.09	0.96
70.	2.75	1.71	3.51	1.09
72.	2.68	1.46	2.49	0.96
74.	1.64	1.56	2.72	1.59
75.	3.64	1.84	2.60	1.41
76.	4.08	1.33	3.71	1.05
77.	3.08	1.69	3.28	1.57
78.	2.81	1.38	2.28	0.91
79.	2.59	1.22	2.64	1.23
80.	3.09	1.49	3.72	0.98
81.	3.86	1.47	3.80	1.01
82.	2.56	1.30	2.21	0.85
83.	2.40	1.34	2.66	1.14
84.	2.66	1.48	3.35	1.18
85.	3.81	1.44	3.65	1.00
86.	3.61	1.40	3.52	1.15
87.	2.19	1.44	2.21	1.05
88.	2.48	1.43	2.22	0.88
89.	2.64	1.39	2.35	0.84
92.	2.15	1.24	2.49	0.93
93.	2.10	1.51	2.03	0.99
94.	1.78	1.29	2.07	0.90
95.	2.06	1.25	2.06	0.87
96.	1.89	1.44	2.14	1.15
97.	2.45	1.42	2.24	0.84
100.	2.13	1.54	2.13	0.89

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES (FORM B, COMBINED MALES AND FEMALES, n=130) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM ANDERSON (1968) ON A COMBINED SAMPLE OF MALES AND FEMALES, n=100

Form B Variable No.	Brodie		Anderson	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
1.	2.99	1.42	3.04	1.20
2.	2.32	1.39	2.27	1.12
4.	2.66	1.58	2.74	1.35
5.	2.98	1.24	2.79	0.81
8.	4.14	1.30	3.90	0.92
9.	3.75	1.30	3.34	0.88
10.	2.63	1.47	2.72	1.27
13.	3.09	1.25	2.95	0.96
14.	2.34	1.72	2.23	1.41
15.	2.55	1.68	2.62	1.48
16.	3.82	1.36	3.60	1.01
21.	4.67	1.27	3.96	1.03
22.	2.03	1.33	2.37	1.00
23.	1.97	1.30	2.39	1.29
25.	3.32	1.35	2.83	1.11
26.	3.65	1.22	3.17	1.07
27.	3.97	1.40	3.87	1.13
30.	3.31	1.40	2.24	0.91
31.	3.43	1.44	3.18	1.06
32.	2.27	1.49	2.19	0.94
33.	1.95	1.42	2.08	1.25
34.	1.92	1.58	2.22	1.27
35.	2.09	1.38	2.13	1.06
36.	3.21	1.48	3.07	1.26
37.	1.99	1.57	2.02	1.14
38.	2.97	1.25	2.62	0.81
39.	3.66	1.34	3.32	1.13
42.	3.38	1.49	2.56	1.01
43.	2.74	1.48	3.67	1.00
44.	2.56	1.59	2.38	1.17
45.	3.32	1.39	3.25	1.24
46.	3.76	1.40	3.51	0.95
47.	2.97	1.74	3.57	1.46
48.	3.52	1.54	3.24	1.11
49.	3.96	1.70	3.62	1.10
50.	3.99	1.51	3.70	1.35
51.	2.52	1.40	2.39	1.18
52.	2.25	1.70	2.70	1.57
53.	3.32	1.46	2.66	0.88
54.	3.02	1.47	3.45	1.20
55.	2.59	1.41	2.23	0.99
56.	3.72	1.31	3.74	0.96
57.	3.82	1.40	3.86	1.33
58.	3.88	1.35	4.00	1.03
59.	3.29	1.81	3.13	1.41
61.	2.85	1.50	3.48	1.31
62.	2.64	1.46	2.41	1.07
63.	3.17	1.56	3.87	1.39
64.	2.05	1.40	2.48	1.10
67.	1.88	1.68	2.10	1.14
68.	3.32	1.36	4.00	1.03
69.	2.38	1.69	2.79	1.28
70.	3.20	1.59	3.89	1.24
72.	1.98	1.50	2.87	1.57
73.	4.33	1.41	3.58	1.41
74.	3.98	1.28	3.79	0.94
75.	3.45	1.28	2.91	0.94
76.	2.29	1.58	2.19	1.24
78.	4.63	1.32	3.87	1.30
80.	2.43	1.21	2.57	1.05
83.	2.27	1.22	2.19	0.95
86.	2.20	1.16	2.15	0.95
87.	2.27	1.64	2.28	1.32
88.	1.38	1.25	2.12	0.97
90.	1.83	1.35	2.01	1.00
91.	2.10	1.38	2.28	0.93
93.	3.21	1.46	2.90	1.12
94.	2.36	1.33	2.22	0.89
96.	2.48	1.27	2.53	0.96
98.	2.48	1.37	2.61	1.03
99.	2.24	1.37	1.05	1.00

both. (Norman's meaningfulness data was not given in his study.) Anderson does not provide a list of the standard deviations for the meaningfulness data, so subsequently, Tables 15 and 16 give only a comparison between the means of the two studies. The first column of each table gives the variable number that corresponds to the number assigned each adjective in the present study (see Tables 7 and 8).

Correlations

Using the means recorded in the previous tables (i.e., 9 to 16), correlations were calculated for:

(a) Social Desirability data--Form A, Males with Norman's Male sample; Form B, Males, with Norman's Male sample; Form A, Females, with Norman's Female sample; Form B, Females, with Norman's Female Sample; Form A, Combined Males and Females with Anderson's Combined Males and Females; and Form B, Combined Males and Females, with Anderson's Combined Males and Females.

(b) Meaningfulness data--Form A, Males and Females with Anderson's sample; Form B, Males and Females with Anderson's sample; and Combined Form A and Form B with Anderson's sample.

Tables 17, 18 and 19 display the correlations and number of common adjectives (in each correlation) for Brodie and Norman, Brodie and Anderson (for Social Desirability) and Brodie and Anderson (for Meaningfulness); respectively.

TABLE 15
COMPARISON OF OBTAINED MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES (FORM A, COMBINED MALES AND FEMALES, n=48) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM ANDERSON (1968) ON A COMBINED SAMPLE OF MALES AND FEMALES, n=100

Form A, Variable No.	Brodie Means	Anderson Means	Form A, Variable No.	Brodie Means	Anderson Means
1.	3.67	3.82	56.	3.52	3.60
2.	3.54	3.38	57.	3.65	3.62
3.	3.02	3.48	59.	3.75	3.80
5.	2.71	3.20	60.	3.67	3.82
6.	3.48	3.52	62.	3.35	3.50
10.	3.52	3.56	64.	3.73	3.76
13.	3.38	3.20	65.	3.44	3.70
14.	3.19	3.22	66.	3.65	3.56
15.	3.54	3.78	67.	3.56	3.62
17.	3.60	3.68	69.	3.29	3.58
18.	3.02	3.28	70.	2.98	3.24
19.	3.46	3.62	72.	3.75	3.66
20.	3.58	3.60	74.	2.77	2.84
21.	3.15	3.58	75.	3.13	3.46
22.	3.33	3.46	76.	3.38	3.60
23.	3.90	3.50	77.	3.19	3.46
25.	2.85	3.36	78.	3.15	3.68
28.	3.21	3.70	79.	3.35	3.48
30.	3.40	3.58	80.	3.10	3.32
32.	3.08	3.14	81.	3.48	3.54
35.	3.40	3.58	82.	3.02	3.54
36.	3.48	3.50	83.	3.50	3.48
38.	3.06	3.46	84.	2.65	3.22
39.	3.58	3.76	85.	3.13	3.20
41.	3.67	3.42	86.	3.73	3.90
42.	2.88	3.46	87.	3.52	3.60
43.	2.46	3.08	88.	3.75	3.80
45.	3.35	3.48	89.	3.25	3.60
46.	3.73	3.70	92.	3.10	3.42
47.	3.10	3.24	93.	3.50	3.76
48.	3.40	3.48	94.	3.15	3.50
51.	3.56	3.60	95.	2.69	3.32
52.	3.56	3.70	96.	3.23	3.34
53.	3.63	3.80	97.	3.31	3.60
54.	3.48	3.34	100.	3.63	3.56
55.	3.54	3.56			

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF OBTAINED MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES (FORM B, COMBINED MALES AND FEMALES, n=48) WITH THOSE OBTAINED FROM ANDERSON (1968) ON A COMBINED SAMPLE OF MALES AND FEMALES, n=50

Form B, Variable No.	Brodie Means	Anderson Means	Form B, Variable No.	Brodie Means	Anderson Means
1.	3.67	3.72	51.	2.90	3.40
2.	3.63	3.54	52.	3.23	3.42
4.	3.63	3.34	53.	3.21	3.32
5.	3.56	3.80	54.	2.88	3.34
8.	3.42	3.64	55.	3.20	3.48
9.	3.67	3.64	56	2.98	3.78
10.	3.38	3.34	57.	3.69	3.26
13.	3.31	3.52	58.	3.19	3.58
14.	3.38	3.42	59.	3.38	3.50
15.	3.46	3.44	61.	3.31	3.20
16.	3.46	3.58	62.	2.81	3.40
21.	3.10	3.38	63.	3.67	3.52
22.	3.40	3.58	64.	3.75	3.20
23.	3.54	3.56	67.	3.60	3.70
25.	3.58	3.76	68.	3.52	3.40
26.	3.63	3.66	69.	2.73	3.34
27.	3.21	3.44	70.	3.35	3.60
30.	3.79	3.86	72.	2.81	3.10
31.	3.58	3.46	73.	3.67	3.54
32.	3.56	3.66	74.	3.75	3.66
33.	3.25	3.34	75.	3.88	3.76
34.	3.12	3.40	76.	3.06	3.50
35.	3.56	3.64	78.	3.52	3.48
36.	3.63	3.80	80.	3.35	3.56
37.	3.31	3.72	83.	3.58	3.36
38.	3.40	3.44	86.	3.33	3.56
39.	3.38	3.42	87.	3.18	3.36
42.	3.52	3.64	88.	3.17	3.56
43.	3.02	3.26	90.	2.75	3.42
44.	3.27	3.46	91.	2.90	3.50
45.	3.40	3.36	93.	3.73	3.78
46.		3.12	94.	3.31	3.62
47.	3.23	3.10	96.	3.31	3.44
48.	3.13	3.56	98.	3.25	3.50
49.	2.60	3.24	99.	3.63	3.76
50.	3.02	3.52			

t-test Results

To ascertain if there were significant sex differences between the Male and Female sample for any given adjective trait descriptor, t-tests were calculated using the means and standard deviations of Form A, Males and Form A, Females; and Form B, Males and Form B, Females. Tables 20 and 21 present the results of this analysis. Significant t's are starred for $p \leq 0.05$, and double starred for $p \leq 0.01$ levels of significance. Table 20 reports 18 significant t's; table 21, 17 significant t's.

Refined List of Adjective Personality Trait Descriptors

A refined list of adjective personality trait descriptors is recorded in Table 22. This list is the result of omitting all adjectives that were found to be outside the criteria limits set out early in the thesis. To reiterate:

(a) Any adjective within the arbitrarily defined cut-off range on Social Desirability (2 to 4 inclusive in the rating scale) was omitted in:

  (i) Form A, Males

  (ii) Form A, Females

  (iii) Form B, Males

  (iv) Form B, Females

  These included omissions of 9, 19, 15, 20 adjectives respectively (overlap not considered).

(b) Any adjective not in the upper range of Meaningfulness (i.e., ≥ 3 out of a possible 4 rating) was omitted. This included 18 from Form A and 17 from Form B.

TABLE 17

CORRELATIONS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES BETWEEN ADJECTIVES COMMON TO BRODIE AND NORMAN FOR SEPARATE MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLES*

	r	n
Males (Form A)	0.77	56
Females (Form A)	0.78	56
Males (Form B)	0.74	52
Females (Form B)	0.86	52

* Males A and B, and Females A and B from Brodie study correspond to appropriate Norman Male and Female sample; r is the correlation, n is the number of adjectives in each correlation.

TABLE 18

CORRELATIONS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES BETWEEN ADJECTIVES COMMON TO BRODIE AND ANDERSON FOR COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLES*

	r	n
Form A	0.81	71
Form B	0.84	71

* Form A and B from Brodie study are correlated with corresponding parts of Anderson's study; r is the correlation, n is the number of adjectives in each correlation.

TABLE 19

CORRELATIONS OF MEANINGFULNESS SCALE VALUES BETWEEN ADJECTIVES COMMON TO BRODIE AND ANDERSON FOR COMBINED MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLES*

	r	n
Form A	0.72	71
Form B	0.50	71
Combined A and B	0.62	142

* Form A, B, and A and B are from Brodie study and are correlated with corresponding adjectives in Anderson study; r is the correlation, n is the number of adjectives in each correlation.

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES, FORM A

Variable No.	t test result	Variable No.	t test result	Variable No.	t test result
1.	0.84	35.	0.41	68.	2.45*
2.	0.30	36.	0.29	69.	1.22
3.	1.84	37.	2.59**	70.	2.29*
4.	1.05	38.	1.54	71.	1.25
5.	1.21	39.	0.51	72.	0.50
6.	1.31	40.	0.39	73.	0.55
7.	2.65**	41.	0.36	74.	0.04
8.	0.96	42.	1.26	75.	0.86
9.	0.28	43.	0.24	76.	2.14*
10.	0.76	44.	0.04	77.	1.70
11.	0.27	45.	0.86	78.	4.34**
12.	0.10	46.	1.44	79.	2.03*
13.	2.45*	47.	1.79	80.	0.48
14.	0.43	48.	1.01	81.	0.31
15.	1.87	49.	3.61**	82.	1.36
16.	0.18	50.	0.71	83.	1.20
17.	0.51	51.	0.72	84.	1.00
18.	1.48	52.	0.80	85.	0.12
19.	0.56	53.	0.16	86.	2.57*
20.	0.09	54.	2.26*	87.	1.04
21.	0.98	55.	1.08	88.	2.90**
22.	0.26	56.	1.04	89.	2.24*
23.	0.43	57.	1.40	90.	0.62
24.	0.80	58.	0.04	91.	1.59
25.	0.07	59.	0.55	92.	2.50*
26.	0.99	60.	1.37	93.	2.43*
27.	0.52	61.	0.56	94.	1.00
28.	1.99*	62.	1.92	95.	0.04
29.	0.13	63.	1.53	96.	1.15
30.	0.07	64.	2.45*	97.	0.20
31.	2.21*	65.	0.47	98.	0.52
32.	0.47	66.	1.88	99.	0.88
33.	0.98	67.	1.24	100.	0.32
34.	1.46				

* For N=124, t-1.96 is significant at p 0.05 (two-tailed)
** For N=124, t-2.58 is significant at p 0.01 (two-tailed)

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES, FORM B

Variable No.	t test result	Variable No.	t test result	Variable No.	t test result
1.	0.44	35.	0.00	68.	0.71
2.	1.53	36.	1.63	69.	0.17
3.	1.78	37.	2.33*	70.	0.15
4.	2.28*	38.	0.27	71.	0.15
5.	1.21	39.	1.19	72.	0.26
6.	0.89	40.	1.02	73.	1.47
7.	2.74**	41.	2.25*	74.	0.04
8.	1.36	42.	1.81	75.	1.20
9.	0.22	43.	1.54	76.	0.33
10.	0.46	44.	1.04	77.	1.60
11.	0.73	45.	0.20	78.	2.00*
12.	3.14**	46.	2.24*	79.	0.08
13.	0.68	47.	0.98	80.	0.75
14.	1.98	48.	0.04	81.	1.47
15.	1.39	49.	0.47	82.	0.50
16.	1.30	50.	1.60	83.	3.20**
17.	0.83	51.	2.85**	84.	2.65**
18.	0.09	52.	0.37	85.	2.75**
19.	2.34*	53.	0.74	86.	0.59
20.	0.17	54.	0.66	87.	0.35
21.	1.44	55.	3.27**	88.	1.14
22.	0.43	56.	0.57	89.	0.84
23.	0.53	57.	1.26	90.	1.27
24.	0.45	58.	0.46	91.	2.80
25.	0.04	59.	0.19	92.	0.60
26.	0.23	60.	1.74	93.	0.78
27.	1.39	61.	1.19	94.	1.25
28.	0.24	62.	0.66	95.	0.73
29.	1.97*	63.	2.00*	96.	0.04
30.	1.27	64.	0.57	97.	0.98
31.	2.37*	65.	1.14	98.	0.21
32.	1.46	66.	0.52	99.	0.08
33.	0.44	67.	0.20	100.	0.09
34.	0.76				

* For N=130, $t \geq 1.96$ is significant at p 0.05 (two-tailed)
** For N=130, $t \geq 2.58$ is significant at p 0.01 (two-tailed)

TABLE 22

REFINED LIST OF ADJECTIVES FROM FORM A AND FORM B*

1. absent-minded
2. anxious
3. blunt
4. changeable
5. cocky
6. complicated
7. conventional
8. critical
9. daydreamer
10. demanding
11. dependent
12. dignified
13. forceful
14. frivolous
15. hesitant
16. idealistic
17. impressionable
18. inhibited
19. leisurely
20. lucky
21. materialistic
22. meditative
23. meticulous
24. naive
25. nonconforming
26. obedient
27. opinionated
28. out-spoken
29. particular
30. perfectionistic
31. persistent
32. possessive
33. preoccupied
34. rebellious
35. reserved
36. restless
37. self-conscious
38. self-denying
39. self-satisfied
40. shrewd
41. sophisticated
42. soft-spoken
43. spendthrift
44. strict
45. subtle
46. temperamental
47. uncompetitive
48. unskilled
49. unsuspicious
50. wary
51. withdrawn
52. aggressive
53. argumentative
54. assertive
55. bashful
56. cautious
57. choosy
58. conservative
59. cunning
60. daring
61. defensive
62. devout
63. emotional
64. excitable
65. forgetful
66. gullible
67. impractical
68. impulsive
69. inexperienced
70. innocent
71. intense
72. lonely
73. mathematical
74. meek
75. methodical
76. moralistic
77. nonchalant
78. opportunist
79. persuasive
80. philosophical
81. precise
82. prideful
83. protective
84. radical
85. restrained
86. scientific
87. self-concerned
88. self-critical
89. self-indulgent
90. serious
91. shy
92. silly
93. stern
94. stubborn
95. studious
96. tense
97. tough
98. unhurried
99. unpredictable
100. unpopular
101. unshakeable
102. unsystematic
103. willful
104. wordy
105. worrier

* Adjectives 1-51 are from Form A; 52-105 from Form B. Also note that adjectives--fiery, inexact, orderly, satirical, deliberative, discontented, fierce, normal, religious--can be added to above list as they are on the borderline of acceptance.

(c) Any adjective that showed a significant difference with respect to sex of subject ($t \geq 1.96$, $p \leq 0.05$) was likewise omitted. This included 18 adjectives from Form A (separate Male and Female samples) and 17 from Form B (separate samples).

This refinement then resulted in a list of 105 adjectives, overlapping adjectives being taken into account. The writer felt that another nine adjectives could be safely added to this list since these adjectives were marginally outside the cut-off bounds (usually by not more than .05 of a decimal) on only one of the criteria. This would then result in a total list of 114 adjective personality trait descriptors, for which several values were known, i.e., Social Desirability, Meaningfulness and sex bias, and would be available for a factor analytic rating study.

INTERPRETATION

Due to the relatively straightforward nature of the study, the interpretation will be brief.

The results of the previous analyses fall generally in line with expectations, that is, the adjectives tended on the whole to be rated within the arbitrarily defined neutral range on social desirability and in the upper range of meaningfulness.

In the social desirability ratings for all of the six groups (Tables 1 to 6), only one adjective is rated > 5.00 and one < 1.6 (from 0 to 6-point scale). Less than one-third of the adjectives fell outside the cut-off points (2 to 4 inclusive) and these mostly by less

than ± half a point on the scale.

In the meaningfulness study for both forms, (Tables 7 and 8), only one-fifth of the adjectives were outside the arbitrarily assigned cut-off point (that is, $\geq$ 3 out of a possible 4), of these only 4 adjectives were greater than one scale-point from the cut-off, the rest were mostly within half a point of the cut-off. Less than one-fifth items revealed significant sex differences, of these only 12 were significant at $p \leq .01$ level. Out of these three categories, several adjectives overlap, i.e., are outside the cut-off points on more than one criterion.

One point that the writer and her supervisor were interested in was that in administering an already neutral range of adjective descriptors (assessed by SDSV's of previous studies), and high scored meaningfulness, would a "spreading out" of the range be noted when extreme reference points (high or low judged SDSV's) were not present. In the previous studies (Norman, Anderson) high and low scored items on SD and high scored items in meaningfulness would serve as "anchors" (just as the end points of rating scale itself serve as an anchor for ratings. Would then the anchor points be shifted, when only neutral items are rated, i.e., would some of the neutral items be given more extreme ratings?

From the results obtained (see paragraph 1 and 2) this may have happened only to a moderate degree. If so, it could account for the only moderate to good correlations (.74 to .86 for SD and .62 for meaningfulness) obtained between the present study and those of Norman and Anderson.

It must be noted that Norman used a different scale for SD than the present study. Correlations are slightly lower averaging 0.79 versus correlations 0.83 with Anderson who had the same scale as the present study. This may be especially obvious (i.e., spreading-over effect) when Anderson (1968) reports that Edwards (Ohio University) using university students reports correlations of 0.98 between means of Anderson study and median ratings of his own study. Likewise, Schmidt and Rosenbaum (University of Iowa), rating 140 of the adjectives in Anderson's list, report a correlation of 0.98. In addition intra-individual reliability (recorded on twenty adjectives from Anderson's list) correlated 0.99 with mean ratings given in his study for between subjects. This implication is welcomed since measures of intra-individual consistency over time items was not undertaken. Sample size should not be a confounding variable affecting the correlations obtained since in all samples compared, the sample sizes are relatively balanced. (See following table.)

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE SIZE FOR SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND MEANINGFULNESS STUDIES BETWEEN BRODIE AND NORMAN-ANDERSON*

Study	Form	Brodie	Norman	Anderson
Social Desirability	Males A	56	50	--
	Males B	65	50	--
	Females A	68	50	--
	Females B	65	50	--
	Combined Male and Female A	124	--	100
	Combined Male and Female B	130	--	100
Meaningfulness	Combined Male and Female A	50	--	50
	Combined Male and Female B	50	--	50

* Table entries denote sample size

Limitations

The present study can be applied only insofar as the mean ratings obtained refer specifically to a sub-population, that is, university undergraduates; the variances refer only to between subject variability; and the refined list of adjectives presented as a result of the study are only a subset of the available adjectives for personality trait description.

CHAPTER VI

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to obtain social desirability and meaningfulness scale values as well as to test for sex biases using a list of selected adjective personality trait descriptors for the eventual purpose of obtaining a refined list of descriptors for a personality rating study.

Associated Literature

A review of the literature relevant to the present study revealed a lack of adequate personality rating tests (the number of scales being too small), confusion and contradiction with respect to the importance of response styles especially acquiescence, though need to control and account for social desirability was more consistently supported. Rating scales were discussed and source pools of adjective trait descriptors were obtained from two separate studies: Norman (1968) and Anderson (1968).

The Study

The study was outlined, first by stating the assumptions upon which selection of adjective descriptors was made, and secondly, outlining the actual criteria used.

The Research Design

The adjective descriptors were listed on separate forms for Social Desirability and Meaningfulness and were rated by separate samples. The sample, instruments, rating scales, scorings and treatment of the data were discussed.

Analysis and Interpretation

Means, standard deviations, t-tests, and correlations were computed. Results were comparable to previous findings. A refined list of adjective descriptors was reported.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The results of the Meaningfulness study showed only a moderate correlation with Anderson (1968) i.e., 0.62. Since only ratings of meaningfulness were obtained, in order for a clearer concept of what each word means as a personality descriptor, further data (following, for example, Norman's (1968) study might be employed.[1] However, it

---

[1] Norman's subjects were asked to give a synonym or short definition for each term presented or, alternatively, to cross out a word if they had no idea of its meaning, the results of which are now being coded for difficulty level, ambiguity, and functional synonyms.

must be noted that the list of available descriptors has been drastically cut down to a reasonably small number that can be handled conveniently by computer, and that the "cutting down" has been undertaken with a series of assumptions about test bias taken into account. It is probably reasonable to assume that this list is as meaningful as any subset of lists that might be chosen.

With respect to some work reported in the literature, but not specifically referred to, in the review of the literature, noteworthy suggestions were offered. Bentler et. al. (1971) presented evidence to show that using "anchored" adjective descriptions in ratings gives higher content validity than using single adjectives. The adjectives were "anchored" by presenting a pair of adjectives, specifically, the polar opposites. The higher validity was obtained due to reduction of acceptance acquiescence (though agreement acquiescence still existed) while in single adjective format both types of acquiescence contributed variance. The higher validity is of note, regardless of the acquiescence interpretation.[2] Guilford (1954) also reported the usefulness of employing anchored scales.

These findings are important to the present study since several polar opposites, namely, the negative member of an adjective pair were omitted in reducing the rating list. However, these opposites were just as neutral with respect to social desirability and as meaningful as their positive member of the pair, as assessed by Norman (1958) and Anderson (1968). These negative adjectives might also be further

---

[2] Block (1972) suggested that control for acquiescence, or other response styles which would also increase content validity, by using correction formulae as proposed by Guilford (1954).

tested for social desirability and included in the list.

IMPLICATIONS

With an adequate pool of descriptors, refined with respect to bias of SD and meaningfulness and sex differences, and with the hopefully added bonus of simplicity of description, both behavior ratings by "others" and self-report can be obtained with subsequent verification of cross-medial similarity. The hypothesis to this last statement being that the "grain" in both media is probably the same[3]. This follows from an early hypothesized statement by Spearman (1927) called the Theorem of the indifference of the indicator. It was originally postulated with respect to the universality of "g", a general pervasive intelligence factor. In brief, it states that "for the purpose of indicating the amount of "g" possessed by a person, any test (i.e., the indicator) will do as well as any other, provided only that its correlations with "g" is equally high. With respect to personality testing, if certain traits dominate the personality then any indicator, either self or other ratings, ought to correlate equally high with the dominant traits, thus being of the same "grain".

As it was the aim of this research to obtain items of neutral desirability, it is here pertinent to indicate the implications

---

[3] An alternative hypothesis has been recently stated by Howarth (1972): "It appears that (1) there are some five or six factors in ratings, (2) there are some 10-12 "stubborn" factors in questionnaires, (3) there are possibly six factors in the objective measures (Howarth, MBR, October, 1972 study). It appears, in fact, that the "grain" in ratings and objective measures is much coarser than that in the questionnaire modes so that if cross-media relations are to be established we will have to proceed from second-order factors in questionnaires to primaries in the other modes. This implies an accurate investigation...of the inter-factor angles."

of the research reviewed earlier in Chapter II as well as to elaborate on the issue.

The main conclusions reached in review of the response style literature were that confusion abounds across researchers as to (a) the existence, (b) the importance and (c) definitions of the various response styles. It should be noted, though, that social desirability as a response style or set received fairly general recognition from those of widely differing points of view (Edwards, 1961, Jackson 1961, Rorer 1965, Block, 1972).

The general confusion about response styles, in the main, would seem to stem from contradictory evidence that has resulted from (a) use of different items, and keying and scoring procedures and (b) different factor analytic procedures used to identify major sources of variance (e.g.: Jackson and Messick, 1961; Block, 1965).

Since 1958, D. N. Jackson has persistently investigated response styles, related problems of test construction and has implemented the findings into his own Personality Research Form (PRF). Implications for the present research are discussed.

Jackson and Messick (1961), in a major article, reported findings that suggested the relative importance of response styles in personality inventories, namely, for the MMPI. This is so, particularly for desirability responding to items which both previously judged ratings for desirability and subsequent correlation of these scales of items to content-responding were obtained. For acquiescence responding only one measure which implied the definition was made, that is, acquiescence was equated with true responding.

Their results indicated that "three-quarters of the common variance and over half of the reliable variance in responses to the MMPI items was attributable to stylistic response consistencies which are apparently independent of specific item content." (p. 786).

A factor analysis revealed two factors which were interpreted as desirability and acquiescence respectively. With respect to content, heterogeneity within the scales did not lend themselves to clear personality characteristics. Considerable redundancy existed when oppositely keyed items are scored separately. Jackson suggested that response styles can be controlled or suppressed by proper keying, scoring and multidimensional scaling.[4]

This sort of rationale applied directly to the present study since the unwanted source of variance created by large numbers of socially desirable items needed to be eliminated from the potential pool of test items.

Jackson (1970), as an outcome of his work in constructing the PRF (see Jackson, 1967, 1968), outlined various precautionary procedures for increasing the validity of personality tests. These concern the need for (a) sound psychological theory, (b) suppression of response style variance, scale homogeneity and generalizability and (d) fostering convergent and discriminant validity.

Since this thesis was devoted to control of response style variance, the other procedures must be considered before any final

---

[4] Jackson and Neill (1971) suggested true-false keying with forced-choice techniques since all things considered, e.g. length of acquaintanceship and correlations with desirability still leave it in an advantageous position, namely, its simplicity and nonipsative nature.

list is administered. Jackson mentioned, with respect to desirability, that since a pool of neutral items might be difficult to obtain or might be psychologically uninteresting, more desirable items would have to be used, partialling out the effect of desirability. Items with high content saturation should be used while a compromise must be made between desirability and convergent and discriminant validity. In the present study 114 neutral items were obtained,[5] many of which form prior putative factor hypotheses. If necessary, other statistical procedures such as those suggested by Block (1972) will have to be considered if items with marked desirability have to be used--but, at least, the SDSV for each item will be known.

Jackson and Singer (1970) reported findings that are of interest to the present research since they pointed to the fact that most desirability studies obtain a general desirability rating (such as the present study) but that indications may be that the variance can be partitioned in terms of subordinate constructs which are distinct though probably correlated with general desirability. With respect to the present research, some of the individual and sex differences may be more fully explainable though several situational variables on different sub-populations would indicate what the "true nature" of desirability might be. Still, a general measure such as obtained in the present study, does eliminate the SD factor.

One last reference will be made to controversy surrounding the response style literature. Since most of the debate is focused upon the MMPI, it is important to note that with the exception of the

---

[5] Actually this figure also takes into account meaningfulness values and sex differences so the actual number of neutral items is higher.

response style controversy, both Jackson et al (1961, 1967, etc.) and Block (1965, 1967, etc.) questioned the MMPI on other grounds: That too much of the common variance is explainable by one factor (i.e. desirability, Jackson; ego-resiliency, Block), its pervasiveness should be reduced, socially neutral items should be used (or as Block, 1972 argued, correctional measures employed), and item pools should be increased to include other dimensions. Again both authors agreed that the MMPI should be left (along with the SD debate) and greater issues attacked.

The writer feels that a debate without withdrawal by either side (Bentler et. al., 1971, 1972; Block, 1971) indicates on some points an unwillingness to yield at all, but the points of convergence are sufficient to allow research to progress fruitfully and the implications of past controversy were considered with respect to the present study. Regardless of the support for desirability both sides admit that unwanted sources of variance and few adequate psychological (only two factors in Block, 1965) factors obtained from MMPI thus far warrant research of a more encompassing nature.

Thorndike Frequency Count

Since the adjectives in the refined list (see Table 22) are the most meaningful as assessed by this study, are they also most commonly used in the English language? Thorndike and Lorge (1952) in a classic study, obtained the frequency count of words occurring in a vast selection of English reading material over a wide age range.[6]

---

[6] Other studies were investigated but were of (a) a more limited nature e.g. Eaton (1967) using only 6000 words from Thorndike in a frequency count across four languages (similar words in all four languages); (b) distributions and general properties of word frequency and did not include specific lists of words, e.g. Gowers (1960), Fries (1965), and Williams (1970).

The following table gives the frequency of occurrence from Thorndike-Lorge for the 114 adjectives from Table 22. In the first column (G) after each word is a number stating the occurrences per million words, up to 49; an A is 50 up to 100 occurrences per million words. The column is the summary of the four succeeding columns. In the other four columns are numbers giving the frequency of occurrences in approximately 4½ million words. The second column (T) is the Thorndike general count of 1931, the third column (L) is the Lorge magazine count, the fourth column (J) is the Thorndike juvenile count and the fifth column (S) is the Lorge-Thorndike semantic count.[7] Adjectives followed by only one number indicate the occurrence in 4½ million words; a zero indicated they were not counted in adjective form.

The figures in the table can be understood in context of all the words investigated by Thorndike-Lorge. Seventy-three percent of the adjectives occur in Thorndike-Lorge's list of most frequently occurring words (including nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc.), another 13% are included in Thorndike-Lorge's second list of most frequently occurring words, while the remaining 13% were not counted in the adjective form.

Some 19,000 words are recorded in Thorndike-Lorge's first list of most frequently occurring words, and upon graduation from high school a student should know at least 15,000 words, this should include

---

[7] The (T) count emphasized frequency in readers, textbooks, the Bible, and the English classics using 285 sources. The (L) count included popular magazines as the Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, True Story and Reader's Digest. The (S) count included words of multi-meaning separating function and meaning as well as literal forms. The (J) count used 120 sources for material used by Grades 3 to 8.

TABLE 24

THORNDIKE-LORGE (1952) FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE COUNT FOR THE 114 REFINED ADJECTIVES FROM FORM A AND B

Variable No. and Name	G	T	L	J	S
1. absent-minded	1	2	26	3	1
2. aggressive	7	28	43	12	51
3. anxious	48	213	237	213	208
4. argumentative	14				
5. assertive	6				
6. bashful	7	90	18	8	11
7. blunt	9	82	26	30	30
8. cautious	8	23	48	56	32
9. changeable	2	16	9	7	7
10. choosy	0				
11 cocky	1	2	17	4	2
12. complicated	13	40	88	25	90
13. conservative	19	57	106	8	175
14. conventional	9	28	64	21	55
15. critical	16	43	60	23	164
16. cunning	28	180	64	180	86
17. daring	9	50	46	50	26
18. daydreamer	2	4	13	20	6
19. defensive	8	18	55	18	62
20. demanding	0				
21. deliberative	10				
22. dependent	13	57	71	22	96
23. devout	4	32	10	10	29
24. dignified	11	70	70	26	36
25. discontented	4	16	50	5	13
26. emotional	9	12	121	2	33
27. excitable	1	8	7	5	5
28. fierce	44	240	114	240	208
29. fiery	19	160	35	93	66
30. forceful	2	16	23	5	8
31. forgetful	2	10	9	16	6
32. frivolous	5	50	23	4	18
33. gullible	5				
34. hesitant	17				
35. idealistic	1	4	11	0	6
36. impractical	1	1	12	3	6
37. impressionable	17				
38. impulsive	3	7	44	7	10
39. inexact	0				
40. inexperienced	5	28	37	18	13

TABLE 24 (Continued)

Variable No. and Name	G	T	L	J	S
41. inhibited	0				
42 innocent	41	210	210	210	117
43. intense	18	40	94	86	110
44. leisurely	8	11	59	47	34
45. lonely	35	130	203	180	127
46. lucky	24	105	220	65	49
47. materialistic	1	5	2	0	11
48. mathematical	5	16	18	12	60
49. meditative	2	28	8	9	8
50. meek	7	65	23	18	29
51. methodical	2	12	10	13	9
52. meticulous	1	3	23	0	5
53. moralistic	0				
54. naive	2	6	29	1	14
55. nonchalant	1	4	10	0	4
56. nonconforming	1	11	2	0	22
57. normal	41	79	335	28	306
58. obedient	7	70	16	40	16
59. opinionated	5				
60. opportunist	9				
61. orderly	9	12	61	33	58
62. outspoken	1	3	7	3	15
63. particular	A	182	461	247	545
64. perfectionistic	0				
65. persistent	10	40	50	25	66
66. persuasive	4	40	11	13	13
67. philosophical	5	23	15	4	63
68. possessive	2	16	20	0	1
69. precise	6	17	41	10	48
70. preoccupied	3	14	29	8	15
71. prideful	14				
72. protective	8	16	62	14	55
73. radical	16	53	51	3	193
74. rebellious	5	55	14	19	16
75. religious	A	226	162	226	441
76. reserved	2	10	11	10	19
77. restless	23	134	126	93	66
78. restrained	0				
79. satirical	1	10	4	1	12
80. scientific	35	57	173	96	306

TABLE 24 (Continued)

Variable No. and Name	G	T	L	J	S
81. self-concerned	0				
82. self-conscious	4	1	58	7	8
83. self-critical	0				
84. self-denying	0				
85. self-indulgent	0				
86. self-satisfied	11				
87. self-skilled	3	11	8	4	40
88. serious	A	175	498	175	498
89. shrewd	13	70	77	46	49
90. shy	21	93	139	105	52
91. silly	30	130	329	16	72
92. soft-spoken	0				
93. sophisticated	4	14	34	0	14
94. spendthrift	1	4	6	7	9
95. stern	36	180	141	180	148
96. strict	12	55	53	22	89
97. stubborn	14	104	95	24	42
98. studious	3	44	9	8	9
99. subtle	12	78	42	34	67
100. temperamental	2	5	25	10	85
101. tense	9	7	125	20	16
102. tough	18	57	202	21	55
103. uncompetitive	0				
104. unhurried	13				
105. unpredictable	6				
106. unpopular	10	70	41	30	63
107. unshakeable	10				
108. unsuspicious	1	10	1	9	4
109. unsystematic	0				
110. wary	7	50	27	41	18
111. willful	6	44	26	19	19
112. withdrawn	12	80	31	58	63
113. wordy	12				
114. worrier	0				

words from 2 or 3 occurrences per million words onward. A grade 8 student would only be required to know words down to a count of 6 per million.

Though results of the present study were obtained on university students, the results from Table 24 indicate according to Thorndike-Lorge that 40% of the adjectives would be familiar to Grade 8 students while 60% would be familiar to high-school graduates. Thus it would seem justifiable to assume that the selected list of adjectives occur frequently in the familiar reading of a university population, on which this thesis was based, however applicability to other groups, e.g. younger students and some adult populations would imply further investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLISON, J., and HUNT, D.E., Social desirability and the expression of aggression under varying conditions of frustration. Journal of Consultant Psychology; 1959, 23, 528-532.

ALLPORT, G.W. and ODBERT, H.S. Trait Names: A psycho-lexical study. Psychological Monographs, 1936, 47, (1, Whole No. 211).

ALLPORT, G.W. Personality: A psychological interpretation. Holt: New York, 1937.

ANASTASI, A. Psychological Testing (3rd Edition), Collier-MacMillan Limited: London, 1968.

ANDERSON, N.H. Likeableness Ratings of 555 Personality Trait Words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 272-279.

BECKER, W.C. A comparison of the Factor Structure and Other properties of the 16 PF and the Guilford-Martin Personality Inventories. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 21, 393-404, 1961.

BENTLER, P.M., JACKSON, D.N., MESSICK, S. Identification of Content and Style: A two-dimensional interpretation of acquiescence. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 186-204.

BENTLER, P.M., JACKSON, D.C., MESSICK, S. A rose by any other name. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 77, 2, 109-113.

BLOCK, J. The Challenge of Response Sets. Appleton-Century-Crofts: New York, 1965.

BLOCK, J. Remarks on Jackson's "review" of Block's Challenge of Response Sets. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1967, 27, 497-562.

BLOCK, J. On further conjectures Regarding Acquiescence. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 205-210.

BLOCK, J. Shifting Definitions of Acquiescence. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 78, 1, 10-12.

BOUCHARD, T.J. Jr. Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the Adjective Checklist and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 1165-1171.

BUROS, O.K. Personality Tests and Reviews, Gryphon Press: New Jersey, 1970.

CATTELL, R.B. The Description of Personality: Principles and Finding in Factor Analysis. American Journal of Psychology, 1945, Vol. 58, 69-90.

CATTELL, R.B. Confirmation and Clarification of Primary Personality Factors. Psychometrika, 1947, 12, 197-220.

CATTELL, R.B. The Main Factors in Questionnaire Self-Estimate Material. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 31, 3-38.

CATTELL, R.B. and SAUNDERS, D.R. Inter-relation and matching of Personality Factors from Behavior Rating, Questionnaire and Objective Test Data. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 31, 243-260.

COUCH, A., and KENISTON, K. Yea sayers and naysayers: Agreeing response set as a personality variable, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 151-174.

CRONBACK, L.J. An experimental comparison of the multiple true-false and multiple-choice tests. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1941, 32, 533-543.

CRONBACK, L.J. Studies of Acquiescence as a factor in the true-false test. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1942, 33. 401-415.

CROWNE, D.P., and MARLOWE, D. A new scale of S.D. independent of psychopathology, Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1960, 24, 349-354.

EATON, H.S. An English, French, German, Spanish Word Frequency Dictionary. Dover Publications, Inc: New York, 1967.

EDWARDS, A.L. The Social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. Dryden Press: New York, 1957.

EDWARDS, A.L. and DIERS, C.J. Social Desirability and the factorial interpretation of the MMPI, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1962, 22, 501-509.

EDWARDS, A.L. and DIERS, C.J. Neutral items as a measure of acquiescence. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 687-698.

EDWARDS, A.L. The Measurement of Personality Traits by Scales and Inventories. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.: New York, 1970.

EYSENCK, H.J., and EYSENCK, S.B. Personality Structure and Measurement. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

FRIES, C. English Word Lists. George Wahl Publishing Company: Michigan, 1965.

GOLDBERG. L.R. A model of item ambiguity in personality assessment. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 467-92.

GOUGH, H.G. and HEILBRUN, A.B. The Adjective Check List Manual, Plato Alto. Consulting Psychologist Press, 1965.

GOWERS, S. The Complete Plain Words, Her Majesty's Stationery Office: London, 1960.

GUILFORD, J.P. Psychometric Methods, 2nd Ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

HOLTZMAN, W.H. Personality Structure, Annual Review of Psychology, 1965, 16, 119-156.

HOWARTH, E. Multivariate Study of Personality, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1971.

HOWARTH, E. et. al. Investigation of Personality factors in a Canadian content. I. Marker structure in personality questionnaire items. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1971, 3, 161-173.

HOWARTH, E. et. al. An item-factor-analysis of the 16 PF. Personality, 1971, 2, 117-139.

HOWARTH, E. Factor Analysis has only just begun to fight--A reply to Lykken. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1972, 6, 268-272.

JACKSON, D.N., Block's The Challenge of Response Sets, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 205-248, 27, 1967.

JACKSON, D.N. A Personological Approach to the Interpretation of Vocational Interest, Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention, APA, 1967.

JACKSON, D.N. and GUTHRIE, G.M. Multi-Trait Multi-Method Evaluation of the Personality Research Form, Proceedings, 76th Annual Convention, APA, 1968.

JACKSON, D.N. A Sequential System for Personality Scale Development, Current Topics in Clinical and Community Psychology, 1970, 2, 61-96.

JACKSON, D.N. and NEILL, J.A. An Evaluation of Forced-Choice and True-False Item Formats in Personality Assessment, Educational and Testing Service, Princeton, 1971.

JONES, R.R. and RORER, L.G. Response Biases and Trait Descriptive Adjectives. Oregon Research Institute, ORI Tecbnical Report, VII, No. 4, September, 1971.

McGEE, R.K. Response style as a personality Variable: By What Criterion? Psychological Bulletin, 1962, 59, 284-295. (a)

McGEE, R.K. The relationship between response style and Personality Variables: I. The measurement of response acquiescence. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 229-233. (b)

McGEE, R.K. The relationship between response style and Personality Variables: II. The preduction of independent conformity behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 347-351. (c)

MESSICK, S. and JACKSON, D.N. "Acquiescence and the Factorial Interpretation of the MMPI." Psychological Bulletin, LVIII, 1961, 299-236.

MORF, M.E., and JACKSON, D.N. An analysis of two response styles: true responding and item endorsement. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1972, 32, 329-353.

NORMAN, W.T. Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 574-583.

NORMAN, W.T. and PASSINI, F.T. A universal conception of Personality Structure? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 44-49.

NORMAN, W.T. 2800 Personality Trait Descriptors: Normative Operating Characteristics for a University Population, University of Michigan, National Institute of Mental Health, Grant Number MH07195, April, 1968.

PARKER, G.V. and VELDMAN, D.J. Item Factor Structure of the Adjective Check List. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1969 29, 605-613.

SELLS, S.B., DEMAREE, R.G. and WILL, D.P. Jr. A taxonomic Investigation of Personality: Conjoint Factor Structure of Guilford and Cattell Trait Markers. Texas Christian Institute of Behavioral Research. Also see: Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1970, 5, 391-422; 1971, 6, 135-185.

SPEARMAN, C. The Abilities of Man, Their Nature and Measurement. MacMillan and Company, Limited: London, 1927.

THORNDIKE, E.L. and LORGE, I. The Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 Words, Teacher's College: Columbia University, New York, 1952.

TUPES, E.C. and CHRISTAL, R.E. Recurrent Personality Factors Based on Trait Ratings. USAF, ASD Tech. Report, 1961, No. 61-97.

WIGGINS, J.S. Strategic Method and Stylistic Variance in the MMPI, Psychological Bulletin, 1962, 59, 224-242.

WIGGINS, J.S. Personality Structure: Annual Review of Psychology, 1968, 19, 293-350.

WILLIAMS, C.B. Style and Vocabulary: Numerical Studies. John Wright and Sons, Ltd: Bristol, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Additional instructions given in Social Desirability Study--Forms A and B:

Rate each word on the 0 to 6 scale as if it were the only word you had describing a person.

For example:

If you were told a person was agreeable how favorably does that word describe a person?

Write all answers in the booklet and fill out the front sheet (information).

FORM A

SDS STUDY

NAME _____ M or F (circle one)

Course _____ Date _____

Instructions

Here is a list of personality traits. Think of a person as being described by each word and rate the word according to how much you would like the person. Use ONE of the numbers from 0 to 6 in each case, with 0 being "least favorable or desirable" and 6 being "most favorable to desirable". Try to use all the numbers about equally often. Rate carefully since you have plenty of time. Do not omit any of the words, there are 100 in this test. Put the number you choose in the blank provided to the left of each word.

FORM A

(___) 1. absent-minded
(___) 2. anxious
(___) 3. artistic
(___) 4. austere
(___) 5. average
(___) 6. blunt
(___) 7. brisk
(___) 8. carefree
(___) 9. casual
(___) 10. changeable
(___) 11. cocky
(___) 12. complicated
(___) 13. compulsive
(___) 14. conventional
(___) 15. critical
(___) 16. cynical
(___) 17. daydreamer
(___) 18. definite
(___) 19. demanding
(___) 20. dependent
(___) 21. dignified
(___) 22. disciplined
(___) 23. discriminating
(___) 24. distractible
(___) 25. eccentric
(___) 26. emphatic
(___) 27. energetic
(___) 28. fearful
(___) 29. fiery
(___) 30. forceful
(___) 31. formal
(___) 32. frivolous
(___) 33. glamorous
(___) 34. glib
(___) 35. hesitant
(___) 36. idealistic
(___) 37. impartial
(___) 38. impressionable
(___) 39. indecisive
(___) 40. inexact
(___) 41. inhibited
(___) 42. inoffensive
(___) 43. irreligious
(___) 44. leisurely
(___) 45. lucky
(___) 46. materialistic
(___) 47. meditative
(___) 48. meticulous
(___) 49. mild
(___) 50. moody

FORM A

(___) 51. naive
(___) 52. nonconformist
(___) 53. obedient
(___) 54. obliging
(___) 55. opinionated
(___) 56. orderly
(___) 57. outspoken
(___) 58. particular
(___) 59. perfectionistic
(___) 60. persistent
(___) 61. possessive
(___) 62. preoccupied
(___) 63. proper
(___) 64. quiet
(___) 65. rebellious
(___) 66. reserved
(___) 67. restless
(___) 68. retiring
(___) 69. sad
(___) 70. satirical
(___) 71. secretive
(___) 72. self-conscious
(___) 73. self-denying
(___) 74. self-possessed
(___) 75. self-satisfied
(___) 76. sentimental
(___) 77. shrewd
(___) 78. silent
(___) 79. skeptical
(___) 80. sophisticated
(___) 81. soft-spoken
(___) 82. spendthrift
(___) 83. strict
(___) 84. suave
(___) 85. subtle
(___) 86. talkative
(___) 87. temperamental
(___) 88. timid
(___) 89. troubled
(___) 90. unassuming
(___) 91. uncompetative
(___) 92. undecided
(___) 93. unhappy
(___) 94. unoriginal
(___) 95. unpoised
(___) 96. unromantic
(___) 97. unskilled
(___) 98. unsuspicious
(___) 99. wary
(___) 100. withdrawn

FORM B

SDS STUDY

NAME _____ M or F (circle one)

Course _____ Date _____

Instructions

Here is a list of personality traits. Think of a person as being described by each word and rate the word according to how much you would like the person. Use ONE of the numbers from 0 to 6 in each case, with 0 being "least favorable or desirable" and 6 being "most favorable or desirable". Try to use all the numbers about equally often. Rate carefully since you have plenty of time. Do not omit any of the words, there are 100 in this test. Put the number you choose in the blank provided to the left of each word.

FORM B

(___) 1. aggressive
(___) 2. argumentative
(___) 3. assertive
(___) 4. authoritative
(___) 5. bashful
(___) 6. acquiescent
(___) 7. calculating
(___) 8. careful
(___) 9. cautious
(___) 10. choosy
(___) 11. controlled
(___) 12. coy
(___) 13. conservative
(___) 14. crafty
(___) 15. cunning
(___) 16. daring
(___) 17. defensive
(___) 18. deliberative
(___) 19. demonstrative
(___) 20. devout
(___) 21. direct
(___) 22. discontented
(___) 23. dissatisfied
(___) 24. dogged
(___) 25. emotional
(___) 26. excitable
(___) 27. fashionable
(___) 28. fierce
(___) 29. flirtatious
(___) 30. forgetful
(___) 31. forward
(___) 32. gullible
(___) 33. high-strung
(___) 34. immodest
(___) 35. impractical
(___) 36. impulsive
(___) 37. indifferent
(___) 38. inexperienced
(___) 39. innocent
(___) 40. intense
(___) 41. jaunty
(___) 42. lonely
(___) 43. mathematical
(___) 44. meek
(___) 45. methodical
(___) 46. moderate
(___) 47. moralistic
(___) 48. nonchalant
(___) 49. normal
(___) 50. objective

FORM B

(___) 51. old-fashioned
(___) 52. opportunist
(___) 53. ordinary
(___) 54. painstaking
(___) 55. passive
(___) 56. persuasive
(___) 57. philosophical
(___) 58. precise
(___) 59. prideful
(___) 60. protective
(___) 61. prudent
(___) 62. radical
(___) 63. religious
(___) 64. resigned
(___) 65. restrained
(___) 66. ritualistic
(___) 67. sarcastic
(___) 68. scientific
(___) 69. self-concerned
(___) 70. self-critical
(___) 71. self-indulgent
(___) 72. self-righteous
(___) 73. sensitive
(___) 74. serious
(___) 75. shy
(___) 76. silly
(___) 77. sociable
(___) 78. soft-hearted
(___) 79. somber
(___) 80. stern
(___) 81. stubborn
(___) 82. studious
(___) 83. submissive
(___) 84. suggestible
(___) 85. teetotaler
(___) 86. tense
(___) 87. tough
(___) 88. unadventurous
(___) 89. unbending
(___) 90. uncultured
(___) 91. ungraceful
(___) 92. unhurried
(___) 93. unpredictable
(___) 94. unpopular
(___) 95. unshakeable
(___) 96. unsystematic
(___) 97. willful
(___) 98. wordy
(___) 99. worrier
(___) 100. worldly

APPENDIX B

Meaningfulness Study

Name _____ M or F (circle one)

Course _____ Date _____

Instructions

Here is a list of personality-trait words. In order to assess the meaningfulness of each word, you are to rate the word on a five point scale, in relation to how easy it would be for you to use the word as a personality description of an actual person known to you. Use one of the numbers from 0 to 4 in each case. The following gives a description of each point on the scale.

0 "I have almost no idea of the meaning of this word."

1 "I have a slight understanding of the meaning of this word."

2 "I have a moderate understanding of the meaning of this word."

3 "I have a reasonably clear understanding of the meaning of this word."

4 "I have a very clear and definite understanding of the meaning of this word."

Do not omit any of the words, there are 200 words in this list. Put the number you choose in the blank provided to the left of each word.

(___) 1. absent-minded
(___) 2. anxious
(___) 3. artistic
(___) 4. austere
(___) 5. average
(___) 6. blunt
(___) 7. brisk
(___) 8. carefree
(___) 9. casual
(___) 10. changeable
(___) 11. cocky
(___) 12. complicated
(___) 13. compulsive
(___) 14. conventional
(___) 15. critical
(___) 16. cynical
(___) 17. daydreamer
(___) 18. definite
(___) 19. demanding
(___) 20. dependent
(___) 21. dignified
(___) 22. disciplined
(___) 23. discriminating
(___) 24. distractible
(___) 25. eccentric
(___) 26. emphatic
(___) 27. energetic
(___) 28. fearful
(___) 29. fiery
(___) 30. forceful
(___) 31. formal
(___) 32. frivolous
(___) 33. glamorous
(___) 34. glib
(___) 35. hesitant
(___) 36. idealistic
(___) 37. impartial
(___) 38. impressionable
(___) 39. indecisive
(___) 40. inexact
(___) 41. inhibited
(___) 42. inoffensive
(___) 43. irreligious
(___) 44. leisurely
(___) 45. lucky
(___) 46. materialistic
(___) 47. meditative
(___) 48. meticulous
(___) 49. mild
(___) 50. moody

(___) 51. naive
(___) 52. nonconformist
(___) 53. obedient
(___) 54. obliging
(___) 55. opinionated
(___) 56. orderly
(___) 57. outspoken
(___) 58. particular
(___) 59. perfectionistic
(___) 60. persistent
(___) 61. possessive
(___) 62. preoccupied
(___) 63. proper
(___) 64. quiet
(___) 65. rebellious
(___) 66. reserved
(___) 67. restless
(___) 68. retiring
(___) 69. sad
(___) 70. satirical
(___) 71. secretive
(___) 72. self-conscious
(___) 73. self-denying
(___) 74. self-possessed
(___) 75. self-satisfied
(___) 76. sentimental
(___) 77. shrewd
(___) 78. silent
(___) 79. skeptical
(___) 80. sophisticated
(___) 81. soft-spoken
(___) 82. spendthrift
(___) 83. strict
(___) 84. suave
(___) 85. subtle
(___) 86. talkative
(___) 87. temperamental
(___) 88. timid
(___) 39. troubled
(___) 90. unassuming
(___) 91. uncompetative
(___) 92. undecided
(___) 93. unhappy
(___) 94. unoriginal
(___) 95. unpoised
(___) 96. unromantic
(___) 97. unskilled
(___) 98. unsuspicious
(___) 99. wary
(___) 100. withdrawn

(___) 101. aggressive
(___) 102. argumentative
(___) 103. assertive
(___) 104. authoritative
(___) 105. bashful
(___) 106. acquiescent
(___) 107. calculating
(___) 108 careful
(___) 109. cautious
(___) 110. choosy
(___) 111. controlled
(___) 112. coy
(___) 113. conservative
(___) 114. crafty
(___) 115. cunning
(___) 116. daring
(___) 117. defensive
(___) 118. deliberative
(___) 119. demonstrative
(___) 120. devout
(___) 121. direct
(___) 122. discontented
(___) 123. dissatisfied
(___) 124. dogged
(___) 125. emotional
(___) 126. excitable
(___) 127. fashionable
(___) 128. fierce
(___) 129. flirtatious
(___) 130. forgetful
(___) 131. forward
(___) 132. gullible
(___) 133. high-strung
(___) 134. immodest
(___) q35. impractical
(___) 136. impulsive
(___) 137. indifferent
(___) 138. inexperienced
(___) 139. innocent
(___) 140. intense
(___) 141. jaunty
(___) 142. lonely
(___) 143. mathematical
(___) 144. meek
(___) 145. methodical
(___) 146. moderate
(___) 147. moralistic
(___) 148. nonchalant
(___) 149. normal
(___) 150. objective

(___) 151. old-fashioned
(___) 152. opportunist
(___) 153. ordinary
(___) 154. painstaking
(___) 155. passive
(___) 156. persuasive
(___) 157. philosophical
(___) 158. precise
(___) 159. prideful
(___) 160. protective
(___) 161. prudent
(___) 162. radical
(___) 163. religious
(___) 164. resigned
(___) 165. restrained
(___) 166. ritualistic
(___) 167. sarcastic
(___) 168. scientific
(___) 169. self-concerned
(___) 170. self-critical
(___) 171. self-indulgent
(___) 172. self-righteous
(___) 173. sensitive
(___) 174. serious
(___) 175. shy
(___) 176. silly
(___) 177. sociable
(___) 178. soft-hearted
(___) 179. somber
(___) 180. stern
(___) 181. stubborn
(___) 182. studious
(___) 183. submissive
(___) 184. suggestible
(___) 185. teetotaler
(___) 186. tense
(___) 187. tough
(___) 188. unadventurous
(___) 189. unbending
(___) 190. uncultured
(___) 191. ungraceful
(___) 192. unhurried
(___) 193. unpredictable
(___) 194. unpopular
(___) 195. unshakeable
(___) 196. unsystematic
(___) 197. willful
(___) 198. wordy
(___) 199. worrier
(___) 200. worldly

END OF TEST